THE CONQUERED CONQUERORS

Elite Power, the Conversion Economy, and the Transformation of Iranian Civilization, 224–1010 CE

PART ONE

The System Before the Storm: The Sassanid Empire, Zoroastrian Power, and the World the Arabs Conquered, 224–651 CE

Thomas J. Bryan, Claude/Anthropic

Introduction: The Longest Conversion in History

In the year 651 CE, the last Sassanid emperor, Yazdegerd III, was murdered by a miller near the city of Merv in what is now Turkmenistan. He had spent the final decade of his reign as a fugitive in his own empire, fleeing westward before Arab armies that had destroyed everything his dynasty built across four centuries. With his death, the Sassanid state — one of antiquity's most sophisticated civilizations, the empire that had fought Rome and Byzantium to exhaustion across three hundred years — ceased to exist as a political entity. The Arab conquest of Persia was complete.

The conversion of Persia to Islam took another three hundred years.

The gap between those two facts — the rapid military destruction of the Sassanid state and the slow, uneven, socially complex process through which Iranian populations became Muslim — is where this study begins. The standard account of Islam's spread through Persia treats the two events as parts of a single story: armies arrived, a great civilization encountered a compelling new faith, and transformation followed. This account is not false in its facts but deeply misleading in its causation. It presents the conversion of Persia as the product of spiritual encounter when the evidence consistently points toward something more mundane and more analytically interesting: a conversion economy in which specific, measurable material advantages attached to adopting Islam and specific, measurable material penalties attached to refusing it, operating over three centuries through the rational calculations of millions of individual families.

Understanding that conversion economy requires beginning well before the Arab armies arrived. The world those armies conquered was not a blank slate. It was the product of four centuries of Sassanid statecraft, of a sophisticated integration of Zoroastrian religion and imperial power that had shaped Iranian social life from the structure of landownership to the calendar of festivals to the meaning of kingship itself. The Arabs who destroyed the Sassanid state encountered a civilization in which the relationship between belief, governance, and material life had been worked out in extraordinary detail across generations. That worked-out relationship was not eliminated by the conquest. It was the substrate on which the conversion economy would operate — the existing system of incentives and penalties that the new Islamic order would gradually reconfigure, creating pressures that made conversion individually rational at every step of a three-century transformation.

This is also the story of something the standard account misses entirely: the moment when the conquered turned the tables. The Abbasid Revolution of 750 CE — in which a coalition dominated by Persian converts to Islam overthrew the Arab Umayyad dynasty and seized the caliphate itself — is the most analytically striking event in the entire history of Islamic expansion. The Persians had converted to the conqueror's religion. Then they used that religion to take the conqueror's empire. What arrived in Persia as Arab military power eventually departed from Baghdad as Persian administrative civilization. The conquered did not merely absorb Islam. They appropriated it, shaped it, and made it their own — creating a Persian-Islamic synthesis that became the dominant cultural form of the medieval Islamic world. This study traces that appropriation from its foundations in the Sassanid state to its completion in the Shahnameh of Ferdowsi, the great Persian epic written around 1010 CE by a Muslim poet celebrating a

pre-Islamic world. By that point, the conversion was so complete that pre-Islamic Persia could be safely celebrated — it was memory, not threat.

Section I: Foundation Conditions — The Sassanid Belief-Power System

Four Centuries of Fire: Zoroastrianism as State Architecture

The Sassanid Empire, founded in 224 CE when Ardashir I defeated the last Parthian king and established a new Iranian dynasty, inherited a Zoroastrian religious tradition that was already ancient. Zoroaster — the prophet whose teachings became the foundation of the faith — had lived perhaps in the second millennium BCE, though the dates remain genuinely uncertain among scholars, and the religion that bore his name had been woven into Iranian cultural life for so long that distinguishing Zoroastrian practice from Iranian identity had become nearly impossible. When the Sassanids elevated Zoroastrianism to the status of an imperial state religion, they were not importing a foreign ideology. They were systematizing and institutionalizing what was already present, making explicit the relationship between royal authority and religious sanction that had been implicit in Iranian political culture for centuries.

The theological content of Zoroastrianism was in some respects remarkably sophisticated for its time and its geographical origins. The tradition posited a cosmic dualism: Ahura Mazda, the supreme deity of truth and light, locked in eternal struggle with Ahriman, the principle of darkness and falsehood. Human beings were not passive observers of this cosmic contest but active participants, their choices between truth (asha) and the lie (druj) contributing to the eventual triumph of good over evil. The sacred fire — maintained in fire temples across the empire as a physical representation of divine truth — connected every community to the cosmic order in a way that was simultaneously theological and deeply local. Each fire had its own name, its own grade in the hierarchical system of sacred flames, and its own community of worshippers whose relationship to Ahura Mazda was mediated through its maintenance.

The Sassanid state built its authority on this theological foundation with considerable sophistication. The emperor's title — Shahanshah, King of Kings — was not merely a claim to political dominance but a theological statement: the king ruled because Ahura Mazda had granted him the divine radiance (khvarenah) that made legitimate rulership possible. A king who ruled unjustly or who was defeated in war had lost his khvarenah — the divine sanction had been withdrawn, which was both the theological explanation and the political legitimation for his replacement. This integration of divine favor and political authority was not merely rhetorical. It had operational consequences: the king's obligation to uphold truth and suppress the lie was a theological requirement that created, at least in principle, a standard against which his rule could be measured. The Zoroastrian tradition provided both the legitimation of kingship and the conceptual framework through which kingship could be criticized — a structural ambiguity that would surface repeatedly in the empire's internal politics.

The physical infrastructure of this belief system was extensive and expensive. By the late Sassanid period, fire temples existed in virtually every significant settlement across the empire, from the great temples of Atash Bahram — the highest grade of sacred fire, requiring elaborate consecration and continuous maintenance — to the local hearth fires that connected ordinary households to the cosmic order. The temples functioned simultaneously as religious centers, administrative nodes, and repositories of community wealth. The endowments that sustained

them — agricultural land, commercial income, donations from the faithful — made the temple network one of the largest organized economic systems in the empire, sitting alongside but partially independent from the imperial fiscal apparatus. Managing this network required a professional interpretive class of considerable size and institutional sophistication.

The Magi: An Interpretive Class With Real Power

The Zoroastrian priestly class — the magi, or mobeds — were among the most institutionally independent interpretive specialists in the ancient world. Their independence had structural foundations: the temple endowments gave them an economic base partially outside royal control; their specialized knowledge of Avestan — the ancient liturgical language in which Zoroastrian scripture was preserved — gave them an informational monopoly that no secular education could replicate; and their role as custodians of the sacred fires gave them a ritual authority that kings could invoke but could not perform themselves. The Sassanid emperor needed the high priest's (mobedhan mobed's) participation in coronation ceremonies, in the great royal fire rituals, and in the theological legitimation of military campaigns. This need was the magi's most powerful political resource.

The relationship between the Sassanid throne and the Zoroastrian priesthood was consequently one of genuine mutual dependence rather than simple royal dominance, and this mutual dependence produced the characteristic tensions of a belief system that had not been fully captured by secular authority. The priesthood could and did oppose individual royal policies, could withhold cooperation from rulers they deemed unjust, and maintained their own institutional hierarchy and succession that ran parallel to the imperial administrative structure. Kartir, the great high priest of the third century CE, left rock inscriptions at multiple sites across the empire recording his own achievements and his influence over successive Sassanid kings — a level of self-promotion that implies a political position secure enough to survive changes of ruler. He presided over the persecution of rival religious communities — Buddhists, Hindus, Christians, Manichaeans, and followers of Mani himself — and the explicit claim in his inscriptions that he had directed these suppressions suggests a priestly authority that could initiate policy rather than merely ratify royal decisions.

This institutional independence was real but had limits that became visible in moments of crisis. When a king chose to challenge priestly prerogatives, the priesthood's resources were defensive rather than offensive: they could withhold legitimation, they could cultivate popular discontent, they could support rival claimants to the throne among the nobility. But they could not, in the final analysis, field armies. The Sassanid Empire's military capacity rested with the king and the great landed nobility, not with the priests. The priesthood's power was therefore strongest when the king chose to govern with their cooperation and weakest when a king was willing to pay the legitimacy cost of defying them openly. This structural reality — the priesthood's genuine but ultimately limited independence — set the terms for the political conflicts that would recur throughout the Sassanid period and would shape the character of the Zoroastrian establishment that the Arabs would eventually encounter.

The priesthood's relationship with the landed aristocracy added another layer of complexity. The great noble families — the dehqans at the local level, the seven great houses that claimed the right to participate in royal succession decisions at the apex of the nobility — were simultaneously the military backbone of the empire and the primary patrons of local religious life. Noble estates funded fire temples; noble sons entered the priesthood as a path to education, status, and participation in the administrative machinery that the priesthood partly controlled. The result was a social system in which religious, military, and economic power were

deeply interpenetrated — not separated into distinct institutional spheres but woven together in the family structures and local communities of the Iranian nobility. This interpenetration would prove crucial to the Arab conquest's aftermath: the families that converted to Islam and retained their local authority would bring their communities with them, because in the Iranian social world, religious practice and social hierarchy were inseparable.

The System Strains: Internal Tensions Before the Storm

A belief-power system that has operated for four centuries accumulates, alongside its institutional strengths, the particular vulnerabilities that institutional success produces. By the late Sassanid period, the Zoroastrian establishment had developed several structural problems that would prove relevant to the subsequent Islamic transformation, though they were not, in themselves, sufficient to explain why Zoroastrianism eventually gave way.

The most significant was the progressive aristocratization of the interpretive class. The great priestly positions — the high priesthood of each major fire temple, the positions of theological authority at the royal court — had become effectively hereditary among noble families, following the same logic that would eventually produce the corruption of the medieval Catholic clergy. The sons of noble houses entered the priesthood not necessarily from vocation but from the social logic of a world in which priestly position was one of the principal avenues of educated men's advancement. The consequence was a priestly class that was socially embedded in the upper levels of Sassanid society in ways that compromised its ability to speak from outside that social world. A priesthood that was also a nobility could not easily criticize the nobility; a theological establishment whose economic base was intertwined with the great estate system could not easily mount a principled challenge to that system when it exploited the poor.

The Mazdakite movement of the late fifth and early sixth centuries CE exposed this structural vulnerability with violent clarity. Mazdak, a religious teacher who may have been a Zoroastrian priest himself, developed a theology that drew on existing Iranian religious traditions to argue for a radical redistribution of wealth: the goods of the world — including women and property — were meant to be shared equally, and the hoarding of resources by the nobility and the priesthood was a manifestation of the cosmic principle of evil, Ahriman's work in the social order. The movement attracted enormous popular support among the peasantry and the poor of Sassanid cities, and King Kavad I (r. 488-531) initially supported it, apparently calculating that Mazdakite redistribution would weaken the great noble families who constrained royal power. The episode is a textbook illustration of a ruler attempting to use a reforming religious movement against an entrenched elite — the same dynamic visible from Henry VIII to modern authoritarian modernizers. It failed, as it so often does, when the movement exceeded what the royal patron intended. Kavad eventually reversed course, and his successor Khosrow I (r. 531-579) suppressed the movement with comprehensive brutality, executing Mazdak and tens of thousands of his followers and restoring the traditional social order. The Zoroastrian establishment, which had been threatened by Mazdakism's critique of priestly wealth, was fully restored. But the underlying conditions that had made Mazdakism possible — the exploitation of the peasantry by an aristocracy whose priestly and noble functions were merged — were not addressed. They persisted, buried beneath a restored surface of order, contributing to the popular disaffection that would make the Arab conquest's aftermath more complex than a simple military occupation.

A second vulnerability was the geographical and ethnic limitation of Zoroastrian universalism. Unlike Buddhism, Christianity, and Islam, Zoroastrianism had developed without a strong tradition of actively seeking converts outside the Iranian cultural world. The faith was, in practice

if not in strict theology, an Iranian religion — its language of worship was Avestan, an ancient Iranian tongue incomprehensible to non-Iranian speakers without years of specialized study; its mythology and ritual calendar were rooted in the Iranian agrarian and pastoral world; and its social institutions, from the fire temples to the priestly families, were embedded in specifically Iranian community structures. The Aramaic-speaking populations of Mesopotamia, the Arab tribal populations of the western frontier, the Armenian communities of the northwest — all of these had their own religious traditions, and the Zoroastrian establishment had made no sustained effort to displace them. Christianity had actually made significant inroads into some of these populations despite official Sassanid ambivalence and occasional persecution. The consequence was that the Sassanid Empire, unlike the Roman Empire at a comparable stage of development, had not generated a universal religion capable of transcending ethnic and linguistic boundaries. When the Arabs arrived with a faith that claimed to speak to all of humanity in terms that required no ethnically particular cultural background, the contrast with Zoroastrianism's ethno-religious particularity would be one of the factors shaping how non-Iranian populations responded.

The most acute vulnerability was financial and military, and it arrived not gradually but catastrophically in the early seventh century. Khosrow II (r. 590-628) was a king of genuine military ambition and limited strategic wisdom who launched an enormous offensive against the Byzantine Empire in 603, capturing Jerusalem in 614, Egypt in 619, and reaching the walls of Constantinople itself. At its maximum extent, this was the largest Persian territorial expansion in centuries, and it temporarily gave the Sassanid Empire control over the richest provinces of the Byzantine world. Then everything reversed. The Byzantine Emperor Heraclius launched a brilliant counter-offensive between 622 and 628, driving the Persians back from their conquests, sacking the great fire temple of Adur Gushnasp in Azerbaijan — the holiest site in Zoroastrian state religion — and penetrating to within reach of the Sassanid heartland. Khosrow refused to negotiate and was deposed and murdered by his own nobility in 628. The dynasty descended into a succession crisis that produced twelve rulers in four years, each claiming legitimacy through a combination of noble support and theological sanction that neither could fully command. By 632, when the Arab armies began their serious push into Persian territory, the Sassanid Empire had been at total war for nearly thirty years, had seen its holiest sites violated, had emptied its treasury, had exhausted its military, and was governed by a young king — Yazdegerd III — whose authority was disputed and whose administrative control of the provinces was fragmenting. The Arabs were not attacking an empire at its height. They were delivering the final blow to an empire already dying.

The Arab-Islamic Movement: What the Conquering Force Actually Was

The armies that destroyed the Sassanid Empire between 636 and 651 CE were not simply a military force. They were the first-generation expression of a new belief-power system — one of the most rapidly expanding in the history of religion — and understanding what made them so effective requires understanding what Islam was at the moment of the conquest, not in the theological terms that later scholars would elaborate but in the immediate material and social terms of the early seventh-century Arabian peninsula.

Muhammad's movement had unified the fractious tribal populations of Arabia within a single generation through a combination that the analytical framework for these studies illuminates clearly: appropriation of the monotheistic religious tradition that was already present in Arabia through Jewish communities and Christian populations, combined with genuinely new doctrines and institutional forms that addressed the specific social conditions of Arabian tribal life. The Quran's insistence on submission to a single God — the word Islam means precisely this —

drew on and explicitly acknowledged the traditions of the Jews and Christians while superseding them; the Prophet was not inventing monotheism but completing and correcting it, the Quran argued. This appropriative relationship to existing belief made Islam immediately comprehensible to populations that had encountered monotheism without committing to it, while the specific content of Muhammad's revelation — its emphasis on social justice, the abolition of the debt practices that devastated Arabian poor, the equality of believers before God — addressed grievances that neither Judaism nor Christianity, as they operated in Arabia, had adequately spoken to.

The institutional expression of this belief in the years immediately after Muhammad's death in 632 CE was the caliphate — a form of authority that combined political leadership, military command, and religious responsibility in a single figure in ways that had no precise precedent in the Arabian world. The first four caliphs — Abu Bakr, Umar, Uthman, and Ali, the Rashidun or Rightly Guided Caliphs — were not kings in any existing sense of the word. They were leaders of a community of believers whose authority rested on their proximity to the Prophet, their knowledge of his teachings, and their capacity to maintain the unity of a movement that could easily have fragmented along tribal lines after its founder's death. That this unity was maintained — imperfectly, amid genuine conflicts, but sufficiently to sustain military expansion on two fronts simultaneously — is itself remarkable, and it reflects the degree to which the Islamic belief system had, in its first generation, genuinely transformed the social relationships among Arabian tribesmen who had spent centuries raiding each other.

The military effectiveness of the early Islamic armies owed something to the genuinely novel social cohesion that the new belief had created, but it owed at least as much to structural factors that had nothing to do with theology. The Arab tribes that provided the military manpower of the conquest were entering a region whose two great powers had just fought themselves to exhaustion; they were fighting populations whose administrative elites had lost both military capacity and popular legitimacy through decades of fiscal exploitation and military draft; and they operated with the strategic flexibility of a military culture that had spent generations developing mobile, decentralized warfare adapted to the Arabian environment. The idea that the Arabian armies succeeded because of the irresistible spiritual force of their message is the Islamic tradition's own account of events, and it contains truth — belief was a genuine force multiplier, producing soldiers who fought with a conviction their opponents often lacked. But the Byzantines and Persians who lost to those armies were not lacking in their own religious convictions. What they lacked was the military and administrative coherence to respond effectively to a threat they had initially dismissed as a minor tribal disturbance.

The Sassanid court's response to Muhammad's diplomatic missions — which the Islamic tradition records as letters sent to the major powers of the region inviting them to accept Islam — reportedly involved Khosrow II tearing up the Prophet's letter and dismissing its author contemptuously. Whether the specific incident is historical, the attitude it represents was real: the Sassanid elite regarded the Arab tribal world as a peripheral zone of marginal importance, suitable for managing through client kingdoms like the Lakhmid dynasty on the frontier but not as a source of serious strategic threat. This failure of strategic imagination — shared by the Byzantines, who were equally surprised by the speed and scale of the Islamic expansion — was not mere arrogance. It reflected a genuine gap in the conceptual equipment available to ancient imperial elites for thinking about how new belief systems could transform the political capacities of peripheral populations. Empires that had spent centuries managing tribal peripheries through a combination of subsidy, division, and occasional military demonstration had no template for what happened when a prophet unified and energized those peripheries with a universalist ideology. The Sassanid elite did not understand what was coming until it arrived.

The Conquest: 636-651 CE

The Arab-Muslim armies crossed into Persian-controlled Mesopotamia in force in 636 CE. The decisive engagement came at the Battle of al-Qadisiyyah, fought over four days in late 636 or early 637, near the Euphrates River. The Persian forces, commanded by the general Rostam Farrokhzad, were numerically larger and included war elephants — the Sassanid military's traditional shock weapon against forces that had never encountered them. The Arab forces, commanded by Sa'd ibn Abi Waqqas, were more mobile, more motivated, and fighting for an ideology that framed death in battle as martyrdom and guaranteed paradise. After four days of inconclusive fighting, the Persian lines collapsed — Rostam was killed, reportedly by an Arab soldier who had crawled under the elephant line — and the Persian army disintegrated. The Arab forces moved immediately on Ctesiphon, the Sassanid capital on the Tigris, which fell after a brief siege. Yazdegerd III fled eastward with what remained of his court and his treasury, and never stopped fleeing.

The speed of the subsequent conquest was extraordinary even by the standards of the period. By 642, Arab forces had won the decisive Battle of Nihavand in the Zagros Mountains — which later Persian tradition called the 'victory of victories' for its finality — and the Iranian plateau was effectively open. Over the following decade, Arab forces reached Khorasan in the northeast, Sistan in the southeast, and Azerbaijan in the northwest. Yazdegerd spent these years attempting to organize resistance from Khorasan, appealing to the rulers of Sogdia and even China for military assistance that never came, and watching his remaining supporters peel away as the material calculus of continued resistance became increasingly unfavorable. His murder by a miller in 651 was the last scene in a tragedy whose conclusion had been determined at al-Qadisiyyah.

What the Arab armies conquered was a physical and administrative landscape of considerable complexity. Mesopotamia — the agricultural heartland of the Sassanid Empire, the region of the great irrigated plains between the Tigris and Euphrates that had sustained urban civilization for millennia — came under Arab control with its administrative machinery substantially intact. The great cities — Ctesiphon, Seleucia, Gundeshapur — were occupied rather than destroyed. The Persian nobility and administrative class that did not flee were typically left in place, provided they submitted and paid tribute. The Arab conquerors were a small military force — estimates of the armies that fought at al-Qadisiyyah range from 6,000 to 30,000 men, figures that represent a tiny fraction of the population of the territories being conquered — and they had neither the administrative capacity nor the initial inclination to replace the existing governmental machinery with their own. The conquest was a decapitation of the Sassanid state, not a replacement of Iranian civilization.

This distinction — decapitation rather than replacement — is the key to everything that follows. The Arab armies destroyed the Sassanid military, captured or killed the imperial family, and eliminated the political structure through which Zoroastrianism had been administered as a state religion. What they did not and could not do in the immediate aftermath of conquest was to reach into the thousands of villages and market towns across the Iranian plateau and restructure the social, religious, and economic arrangements that had organized life there for generations. The fire temples still stood. The magi still officiated at their rituals. The dehqan families still held their estates and collected their rents. The Persian-speaking population of the plateau, from the Caspian coast to the edge of the central desert, remained overwhelmingly Zoroastrian for another century and a half after the battle of al-Qadisiyyah. The conquest had changed who commanded the armies and collected the imperial taxes. It had not yet changed what people believed or how they worshipped.

Section II: The Initial Arrangements — How Conquerors Managed a World They Could Not Yet Transform

The Dhimma System: Organized Tolerance as Revenue Mechanism

The administrative arrangements through which the early Arab caliphate governed its non-Muslim subjects were organized around a concept with no precise equivalent in the Roman or Sassanid administrative traditions: the dhimma, a term that might be translated as 'protected covenant.' Non-Muslim communities — Jews, Christians, and, after some theological deliberation, Zoroastrians — could maintain their religious practice, their internal community governance, their property rights, and their legal customs in exchange for the payment of a specific tax, the jizya, which marked their subordinate but tolerated status within the Islamic order. The dhimma system was genuinely tolerant by the standards of the period in ways that deserve acknowledgment: forced conversion was formally prohibited, existing religious communities were not generally compelled to abandon their institutions, and the practical administration of dhimmi communities was largely left to their own internal authorities.

It was also, simultaneously, a fiscal instrument and a status hierarchy. The jizya was levied specifically on non-Muslim adult males capable of paying — women, children, the elderly, and the destitute were generally exempt — and its rates varied by time and place but were universally understood as a payment that marked the payer's political subordination. The theological justification, rooted in the Quran's instructions about the treatment of the People of the Book, was that the payment purchased protection and the freedom to practice one's faith. The material reality was that it extracted revenue from non-converting populations while simultaneously marking the boundary between the Muslim community (the umma) and those outside it in a way that was economically tangible and socially visible. Every dhimmi who paid the jizya was, at the moment of payment, enacting in physical form the political relationship between conqueror and conquered.

For the Zoroastrian population of Persia, the dhimma system represented a fundamental disruption of the world they had known even where it preserved the outward forms of their religious life. Under the Sassanid state, Zoroastrianism had been the religion of imperial power — its temples endowed by royal grant, its priesthood funded by state revenue, its calendar the calendar of official life, its festivals the festivals of the court. The magi had not been a tolerated minority managing their own affairs at the pleasure of a foreign ruler; they had been the theological foundation of the political order itself. Becoming a dhimmi community — maintaining Zoroastrian practice within the dhimma framework — meant accepting a fundamental demotion in civilizational status for which the tradition's own self-understanding provided no comfortable language. The Zoroastrian texts compiled in the aftermath of the conquest are shot through with a sense of cosmic wrongness: this was not supposed to happen, this was not supposed to be possible within the framework of a worldview in which Ahura Mazda's ultimate triumph over Ahriman was a theological given. The empire that had been the physical embodiment of that triumph on earth had been destroyed by people who worshipped neither Ahura Mazda nor the fire.

The early Islamic sources record debates among the Arab conquerors about whether Zoroastrians qualified for dhimmi status at all. Strict readings of the Quranic provisions protecting the People of the Book suggested that they applied to Jews and Christians specifically, as possessors of earlier divine scripture. Zoroastrians were not obviously in that

category — the Avesta was not the Torah or the Gospels, and Zoroastrian theology's dualism was in some respects hard to reconcile with Islamic monotheism. The practical resolution of this debate — driven less by theological analysis than by administrative necessity — was to extend dhimmi status to the Zoroastrians on the pragmatic grounds that the alternative, treating the entire Iranian population as pagans without protected status, would have made the empire ungovernable. The hadith that attributed to the Prophet the statement 'treat them as you treat the People of the Book' provided the theological cover for what administrative reality required. This is a pattern visible throughout the conversion process: theological positions were adjusted to accommodate the material facts on the ground rather than the reverse.

The Garrison Cities and the Separation of Worlds

The Arab conquerors' initial response to governing an enormous and culturally alien empire was spatial segregation: they built their own garrison cities, the amsar, in which the Arab military community lived separately from the conquered population. Kufa and Basra in Mesopotamia, founded in the 630s and 640s, were the first and most important of these — substantial cities built from scratch to house Arab soldiers and their families, with mosques, markets, and the administrative apparatus of the growing caliphate, existing alongside but distinct from the Persian cities and villages that surrounded them. Ctesiphon, the old Sassanid capital, was not made the Arab center of operations; Kufa was founded nearby as a deliberate administrative and physical separation between the conquerors and the conquered.

This segregation was partly practical — concentrating military forces in defensible positions — and partly ideological, reflecting early Islamic concerns about the corruption that might follow from too close integration with non-Muslim populations whose customs and beliefs could dilute the purity of the new community. But it had an unintended consequence that would shape the conversion process for the following century: it created a visible, geographically concentrated Muslim community around which conversion could organize itself. An Iranian who wished to convert to Islam knew where to go, because the Muslim community was not dispersed throughout the existing Iranian settlement pattern but concentrated in specific new cities where the full institutional expression of Islamic life — mosques, Islamic legal courts, markets organized around Islamic commercial norms, the shared experience of Friday prayer — was available. Conversion to Islam in the early period meant, for many Iranians, an actual physical migration to the garrison cities, becoming a mawla — a client attached to an Arab tribe — and beginning the process of integration into the Muslim community through that attachment.

The mawali system — the institution through which non-Arab converts attached themselves to Arab tribal structures — was the first mechanism through which individual Iranians could enter the Muslim community, and its workings reveal with particular clarity how conversion and material calculation intertwined from the beginning. An Iranian who converted and became a mawla of an Arab tribe gained a number of specific material advantages: exemption from the jizya, in principle; access to the distribution of war booty that circulated through the Muslim community; the legal standing that came with membership in a recognized tribal unit within the Islamic administrative framework; and, crucially, the commercial and administrative networks that were increasingly organized around Islamic institutional forms. The Arab tribes themselves accepted mawali partly from genuine religious motivation — the spread of Islam was a theological good — and partly because the administrative machinery of the caliphate was operating in a language and within institutional frameworks that required Persian expertise, and having Persian clients who had converted and were available for administrative service was practically valuable.

What Conversion Meant — and Did Not Mean — in the Seventh Century

The conversion of an individual Iranian to Islam in the seventh century CE was, in immediate experiential terms, a relatively modest transformation of daily religious practice combined with an enormous transformation of political and social status. The theological requirements of conversion were simple: the declaration of the shahada — the testimony that there is no god but God and Muhammad is his messenger — and acceptance of the five pillars of Islamic practice: prayer five times daily, the giving of alms (zakat), fasting during Ramadan, the pilgrimage to Mecca if financially possible, and the shahada itself as ongoing commitment. None of these requirements demanded an immediate rupture with the entire fabric of Iranian cultural life. A new convert could continue speaking Persian, living in a Persian community, eating Persian food, organizing his family life according to Persian social customs, and farming his land according to Iranian agricultural traditions. What changed was his relationship to the Islamic legal and administrative system, his participation in the Friday prayers at the mosque, his status relative to both the Arab military elite and his remaining Zoroastrian neighbors.

Richard Bulliet's study of conversion rates in medieval Persia — the most rigorous quantitative analysis available, using the evidence of name-change patterns in biographical dictionaries to track when Iranian families adopted Arabic and Islamic names across generations — suggests that conversion to Islam in Persia followed an S-curve pattern over roughly three centuries. In the first century after the conquest, conversion was slow: perhaps five to eight percent of the Iranian population had converted by 700 CE, a generation and a half after the conquest. The pace accelerated through the eighth and ninth centuries, reaching perhaps fifty percent of the population by 820-850 CE and approaching ninety percent or more by 950-1000 CE. The curve reflects the social logic of conversion under the dhimma system: early adopters faced high social costs within their own communities and gained significant material advantages by entering the small but growing Muslim community; middle-period converts joined what was becoming the majority faith and faced lower social costs; late adopters faced the escalating social costs of being a diminishing and increasingly marginal minority in a society that had substantially reorganized itself around Islamic institutions.

What the S-curve makes visible is that the conversion of Persia was not a spiritual event with a clear beginning — a moment of encounter with Islamic truth — but a social process that unfolded according to the same dynamics that govern any fundamental change in social practice: early adoption by those with most to gain or least to lose, followed by middle adoption driven by the growing costs of non-conformity, followed by late adoption under the pressure of genuine minority status. The spiritual content of the conversion was real for those who experienced it sincerely, as it was real for many people at every stage. But the timing and distribution of conversion across Iranian society maps onto the distribution of material incentives and penalties rather than onto any identifiable pattern of spiritual experience. The families that converted first were disproportionately those with the most to gain from entering the Muslim administrative and commercial network and the most to lose from continued non-Muslim status. The families that converted last were disproportionately those whose social world — the local community, the family network, the economic arrangements — was most insulated from the pressures the Islamic administrative system was generating.

The Zoroastrian Establishment Faces the New Order

The Zoroastrian priestly class — the magi — faced the conquest and its aftermath in a position structurally analogous to that of the Catholic Church facing a sudden political transformation: an institution that had been the ideological backbone of the state found itself suddenly outside the

political order, managing its own internal affairs under a framework of toleration that was simultaneously protective and constraining. The magi's response to this situation varied by time, place, and individual calculation, and understanding that variation is essential to understanding why the Zoroastrian community eventually contracted to insignificance.

In the immediate aftermath of the conquest, some portion of the Zoroastrian priestly class collaborated with the new rulers in ways that preserved institutional continuity at the cost of explicit acknowledgment of the new political order. Fire temples that submitted peacefully to Arab authority were generally left intact; the magi who officiated at them continued to receive the endowment income that sustained them. The Arab garrison commanders, who needed functioning local administrative structures and were not initially inclined to invest in creating new ones, found it practically useful to leave the existing Zoroastrian institutional infrastructure in place provided it acknowledged Arab political authority and paid the required tribute. This arrangement was tolerable for the magi as long as the expectation was that it was temporary — a disruption from which recovery was possible, as Iranian civilization had recovered from previous invasions — but agonizing as it became clear over decades that the Arab presence was permanent and the political structure that had given Zoroastrianism its state-religion status was not returning.

Some Zoroastrian communities chose flight rather than accommodation. The most consequential migration was to India, where communities of Iranian Zoroastrians — the people who would eventually be called Parsis, from the Persian word for Persian — established themselves, primarily in Gujarat, between approximately the eighth and tenth centuries CE. The Parsi communities in India maintained Zoroastrian practice in exile with remarkable tenacity; their descendants today, numbering perhaps 70,000 worldwide and concentrated in Mumbai, represent one of the most direct surviving connections to the pre-Islamic Persian world. But the migration to India was, from the perspective of Zoroastrianism's role in Iran itself, an acknowledgment of defeat: the communities that left were removing themselves from the conversion economy rather than competing within it, choosing preservation in exile over the increasingly costly struggle to maintain their tradition in the land of its origin.

The magi who remained in Persia faced the long-term arithmetic of the dhimma system with a clarity that their texts, compiled in increasing urgency from the ninth century onward, make visible. The fire temples required income to maintain their sacred fires, pay their priests, and sustain the ritual calendar. That income came from temple endowments and from the contributions of the lay Zoroastrian community. As that community shrank through conversion, the economic base of the temple system shrank with it. The loss of income forced consolidation — fewer fires maintained, fewer priests employed, smaller communities of worshippers sustaining a smaller institutional network — which in turn made the Zoroastrian community less visible, less socially central, and less capable of providing the full range of social services that a religious community provides to its members. Young people in communities where the mosque was the center of social life and the ulama provided legal services, mediated disputes, and blessed marriages found less and less reason to maintain attachment to a shrinking institution whose political and social relevance was diminishing with each generation. The logic was self-reinforcing in the direction of disappearance.

Continues in Part Two: The Conversion Economy — Material Incentives, Umayyad Arab Supremacism, and the Slow Mathematics of Transformation, 651–750 CE

THE CONQUERED CONQUERORS

Elite Power, the Conversion Economy, and the Transformation of Iranian Civilization, 224–1010 CE

PART TWO

The Conversion Economy: Umayyad Arab Supremacism, Material Incentives, and the Slow Mathematics of Transformation, 661–750 CE

Section III: The Umayyad Caliphate — Islam's Governing Contradiction

The Empire That Preached Equality and Practiced Hierarchy

The Umayyad caliphate, which came to power after the first Muslim civil war in 661 CE when Muawiya ibn Abi Sufyan outmaneuvered Ali ibn Abi Talib's supporters and established his dynasty in Damascus, governed the largest empire the Arab world had ever produced with a contradiction at its administrative core that it never resolved. Islam's foundational theological claim was universal: the umma, the community of believers, was defined by faith alone, not by birth or tribe or ethnicity. The Quran stated with unusual clarity that no Arab was superior to a non-Arab except through piety. This was not peripheral to the religion's message but central to it, one of the features that distinguished Islam most sharply from the tribal particularism of pre-Islamic Arabian society and that made it intelligible and appealing to non-Arab populations encountering it for the first time. When an Iranian convert to Islam heard that he was the equal of any Arab Muslim in the eyes of God, he was hearing something that the Islamic tradition genuinely meant and that represented a real departure from the social logic of the world he had grown up in.

The Umayyad state did not honor this claim. Arab identity remained, throughout the Umayyad period, the functional qualification for the full material benefits of membership in the conquering community. The stipend system — the diwan — which distributed shares of conquest revenue among the Muslim military community, was organized around Arab tribal genealogy. An Arab soldier received his share according to his tribe's proximity to the Prophet and the timing of his family's conversion; the share was calculated through lines of descent that no amount of theological conversion could manufacture for someone born outside the Arabian peninsula. Non-Arab converts — the mawali — were attached to Arab tribes as clients rather than members, which gave them legal standing within the Islamic system but placed them at the bottom of the stipend distribution hierarchy. A Persian who had converted, served in the army, and fought in the same battles as Arab soldiers received a smaller share of the proceeds on the grounds that his tribal lineage placed him lower in the hierarchy of claims. The theological equality of believers and the material inequality of the stipend system existed simultaneously, and the tension between them was visible to everyone subject to it.

The land tax arrangements in the conquered Persian territories made the contradiction even more explicit. The early Islamic fiscal system distinguished between kharaj — the land tax paid on agricultural land, which continued regardless of the owner's religion — and jizya — the poll tax paid specifically by non-Muslim adult males as the price of dhimmi status. The theological logic of the system suggested that conversion to Islam should produce exemption from the jizya, since that tax was specifically a mark of non-Muslim status. This implication created an immediate fiscal problem for Umayyad administrators: if every converted Persian was exempted from the jizya, the tax base would collapse as conversion accelerated. The Umayyad solution, applied across multiple provinces and formalized under different governors at different times, was to continue collecting the jizya from Persians who had converted, or to reclassify the kharaj as a tax on the land rather than on the person, so that conversion did not trigger exemption. In practical terms, this meant that Iranian converts to Islam were paying taxes that Islamic theology said they should not be paying, as a consequence of policy decisions made by an Arab dynasty that needed the revenue more than it needed theological consistency.

The governance logic of this arrangement was transparent to everyone involved and produced a specific kind of grievance — not the diffuse resentment of people who feel generally oppressed but the precise, articulable anger of people who have been promised something specific and have not received it. Iranian converts knew the theology. They knew what conversion was supposed to mean. They knew what the Quran said about the equality of believers. And they could observe, in the distribution of stipends, in the continuation of tax obligations, in the composition of the administrative elite in Damascus, that the practice diverged from the theology in ways that consistently favored Arab identity over Islamic belonging. This grievance was the political fuel that would eventually power the Abbasid Revolution. Understanding how it accumulated — how it built through specific material experiences in specific social contexts over nearly a century — requires moving from the level of imperial policy to the level of the families and communities where the conversion economy actually operated.

The Dehqan Calculation: Landed Nobility Faces the New Order

The dehqans — the Iranian landed nobility below the level of the great aristocratic houses, the local landlords who had managed villages and small estates across the Iranian plateau for generations — were the social class whose response to the Arab conquest most directly shaped the pace and character of the subsequent Islamization. They were numerous enough to matter at the population level, institutionally embedded enough to bring their communities with them when they chose a direction, and economically positioned in ways that made their calculation legible in the historical record even through the filter of Islamic-era sources that were not primarily interested in the material motivations of Persian converts.

The dehqan's fundamental asset was land. His estate was the source of his income, his social status, the material basis of his family's position across generations. The question that every dehqan family faced after the conquest was whether and how that asset could be preserved under the new political order. The answer, which emerged through practice rather than policy across the first several decades of Arab rule, was that land preservation was generally possible provided the dehqan acknowledged Arab political authority, paid the required land tax, and maintained the local administrative functions — tax collection, dispute adjudication, infrastructure maintenance — that the Arab garrison commanders needed someone to perform and had no institutional capacity to perform themselves. The conquerors needed administrators because conquest does not come with an administrative manual. The administrators needed to demonstrate indispensability because indispensability was their protection.

The dehqans who successfully negotiated this transition in the seventh century were performing what can be recognized as a classic pattern of elite accommodation under conquest: demonstrating enough cooperation to survive while preserving enough of the existing arrangement to remain economically functional. They collected taxes for the new masters as they had collected them for the old. They adjudicated local disputes through the existing frameworks of customary law. They maintained the irrigation systems and the agricultural infrastructure on which the tax base depended. In exchange, their estates remained theirs, their local authority remained theirs, and their Zoroastrian religious practice remained theirs — subject to the dhimmi constraints but not abolished. Many dehqan families maintained this arrangement for generations after the conquest without converting, calculating that the costs of non-conversion — the jizya, the formal subordinate status, the social friction of being non-Muslim in an increasingly Muslim administrative world — were outweighed by the social costs of conversion within a community that still stigmatized apostasy from the ancestral faith.

The calculation began to shift as the Umayyad period progressed and the material advantages of remaining within the Islamic administrative network became clearer and more concrete. The Islamic commercial network — the web of trade relationships, credit arrangements, and contractual conventions that connected Muslim merchants across the caliphate's enormous territory — was becoming the dominant economic structure of the region, and participation in it was significantly easier for Muslims than for dhimmis. A Muslim merchant had access to Islamic legal institutions for contract enforcement, could participate in the partnership structures (mudaraba, musharaka) that Islamic commercial law had developed, and moved through the caliphate's territory without the visible markers of subordinate status that dhimmis carried. A Zoroastrian merchant operating in the same environment was not legally prohibited from trade, but he was doing business in a system increasingly organized around Islamic institutions from which he was at least partially excluded. The commercial pressure toward conversion was not a single decisive moment but a cumulative friction that built across decades.

The administrative pressure was more acute and more direct. As the Umayyad caliphate's administrative machinery matured through the late seventh century — most decisively under the Caliph Abd al-Malik (r. 685-705) and his governor for the east, Hajjaj ibn Yusuf — Arabic replaced Persian and Greek as the language of official administration, and Islamic legal categories replaced Sassanid administrative categories as the framework through which governmental business was conducted. This Arabicization of the bureaucracy was not primarily motivated by a desire to pressure Persians into conversion; it was motivated by the practical administrative benefits of a unified language and legal framework across a vast empire. But its effect on dehqan families was to make Arabic literacy — and by extension, participation in the Islamic educational and legal networks through which Arabic literacy was transmitted — a professional requirement for continued relevance in the administrative system. A dehqan who wanted his sons to participate in the administrative machinery that determined tax assessments, adjudicated property disputes, and managed the infrastructure on which estate income depended needed those sons to be literate in Arabic and familiar with Islamic legal categories. The path to that literacy and familiarity ran through the institutions of Islamic education, which were organized around and inseparable from the practice of the faith.

Merchants, Craftsmen, and Urban Communities: The Bazaar as Conversion Engine

The cities of the Iranian plateau — Nishapur, Merv, Isfahan, Rayy, Hamadan — were the points at which the conversion economy operated most intensively and most visibly during the Umayyad period. Urban populations were more exposed than rural ones to the administrative and commercial machinery of the caliphate; they were more mobile, more connected to long-distance trade networks, more dependent on the institutional frameworks — courts, contracts, guilds, credit arrangements — that the Islamic system was progressively colonizing. The Iranian merchant and craftsman communities in these cities experienced the material logic of conversion in daily, concrete terms that the rural dehqan felt mainly through occasional encounters with tax collectors and administrative officials.

The bazaar — the organized market that was both the physical and institutional center of Iranian urban commercial life — became over the Umayyad period an increasingly Islamic institution, not through any explicit policy of Islamization but through the organic growth of Muslim participation and Muslim institutional forms. The mosque and the bazaar were adjacent in the physical layout of Islamic cities, and the connection was not merely architectural. Islamic law provided a comprehensive framework for commercial transactions — rules for partnerships,

credit, debt, contracts, and dispute resolution — that was administered through the qadi courts that the caliphate established in every significant city. Merchants who operated within this framework gained access to enforceable contract law; merchants who operated outside it depended on customary arrangements that carried no equivalent institutional backing. The competitive advantage of Islamic commercial institutions was real and measurable in the reliability of contracts and the availability of credit, and accessing those advantages did not formally require conversion but was significantly smoother for those who had converted and thus had full legal standing in the qadi court system.

The craft guilds and workshop communities of Iranian cities faced a related but distinct dynamic. The skills concentrated in these communities — metalworking, textile production, ceramics, leather work — were valuable to the caliphate's administrative and commercial apparatus, and the artisans who possessed them had leverage that rural agricultural populations did not. An Iranian metalsmith whose family had worked in Nishapur for generations was not easily replaceable; his skill was embedded in a specific community and transmitted through specific apprenticeship relationships that could not simply be administratively reorganized. This leverage allowed craft communities to maintain non-Muslim religious practice longer than other urban groups, negotiating their accommodation with the new order from a position of specialized economic importance. The historical record — such as it is, filtered through Islamic-era sources more interested in jurisprudential questions than in craft community sociology — suggests that certain craft traditions maintained Zoroastrian religious identity well into the Abbasid period precisely because their economic indispensability provided a degree of protection from the full pressure of the conversion economy.

The conversion of Iranian urban populations was further complicated by the presence of other dhimmi communities with whom the Zoroastrians competed for a defined but shrinking social space. Jewish communities had been established in the cities of Mesopotamia and western Persia for centuries, maintaining their own legal institutions, commercial networks, and religious life under successive empires with a practiced adaptability that Zoroastrians had never needed to develop. Christian communities — Nestorian Christians who had been the Sassanid Empire's administrative backbone in some provinces, their patriarchate centered in Ctesiphon — were similarly experienced in managing minority religious identity under non-Christian political authority. Both communities had developed theological frameworks for understanding their relationship to political power that did not require that power to be religiously compatible with their own tradition; Zoroastrianism, whose entire self-understanding was predicated on the identification of the Iranian political order with cosmic truth, had no comparable framework. The comparative resilience of Jewish and Christian communities in the face of the conversion economy — communities that maintained substantial populations in the Islamic world for centuries where the Zoroastrian community eventually shrank to near-invisibility — reflects, among other factors, this difference in institutional preparation for minority existence.

The Jizya in Practice: How a Tax Becomes a Transformation Engine

The jizya — the poll tax on dhimmi adult males — appears in Islamic legal texts primarily as a theological and jurisprudential category: the mechanism through which the protected status of non-Muslim communities was formalized and through which the Islamic state's obligation of protection was purchased. Reading the tax through the lens of material consequences rather than legal theory reveals its function as a transformation engine: not merely a revenue mechanism but a systematic pressure that made conversion increasingly rational at every income level over time.

The rates of the jizya varied considerably across the Umayyad period and across different provinces, but the general structure was tiered by economic capacity: the wealthy paid more, the middling paid a standard rate, and the poor paid less or were nominally exempt. In the early decades of Arab rule, when the Iranian population remained overwhelmingly Zoroastrian and the tax base was correspondingly large, the jizya was a significant but manageable imposition — one cost among many that a prosperous dehqan or merchant family could absorb without reconsidering its religious identity. But the tax's logic changed as conversion began to occur, because the jizya was collected from the dhimmi community as a whole and the burden was distributed among its members. As individual families converted and left the dhimmi category, the remaining non-converting families found themselves responsible for a revenue obligation that was now shared among fewer payers. The tax burden per remaining non-Muslim family increased as the community shrank, creating a self-reinforcing pressure: conversion reduced the community, which increased the burden on those who remained, which increased the incentive for further conversion.

The actual collection of the jizya was a ritual of social humiliation as well as a fiscal transaction. Islamic jurisprudence debated extensively how the collection should be conducted, and the most demanding interpretations required that the dhimmi payer appear in person, pay the tax while standing rather than seated, and receive it with a visible acknowledgment of his subordinate status — accounts describe collectors grabbing the payer by the collar, striking him lightly, or administering other physical tokens of submission. The historical record on how rigorously these humiliation protocols were actually enforced varies considerably by time and place; many governors clearly administered the tax as a relatively routine fiscal operation without theatrical performance of subordination. But the formal requirement for humiliation was written into the jurisprudential tradition, and even its partial enforcement was a recurrent reminder to dhimmi payers that their status was not merely fiscally but socially inferior. For a dehqan family that had managed its estate and administered local justice under the Sassanid order with full aristocratic dignity, the experience of paying the jizya under conditions designed to signal subordination was a specifically calibrated social cost added to the fiscal one.

The interplay between the jizya and the kharaj — the land tax that continued regardless of the landowner's religious status — created a particularly acute pressure on the dehqan class during the Umayyad period. The theological promise that conversion would eliminate the jizya while the Umayyad administrative reality continued to collect it from converts, or reclassified the obligation as kharaj rather than jizya so that conversion produced no fiscal relief, was experienced as a specific betrayal. The Iranian administrators and legal scholars who would later contribute to the Islamic jurisprudential tradition spent considerable energy on this question — the proper relationship between conversion and tax obligation — precisely because it was a live controversy whose resolution had direct material consequences for the people arguing it. The fact that the argument was conducted within Islamic legal categories, using Islamic jurisprudential methods, by people who were themselves converts to Islam, is itself analytically significant: by the mid-Umayyad period, the debate about whether Iranian converts were being treated fairly was being conducted inside the Islamic framework rather than against it. The converted were using the conqueror's intellectual tools to argue for the conqueror's theological promises to be honored.

The Mawali: Islam's Internal Class Problem

The mawali — the non-Arab clients of Arab tribes, the primary institutional category through which Iranians entered the Muslim community during the Umayyad period — constituted by the early eighth century a substantial and increasingly educated population whose relationship to

the caliphate's social hierarchy was structurally unstable in ways that the Umayyad dynasty never found a way to manage. They were Muslims, participating in Friday prayers, observing the fast of Ramadan, accepting Islamic legal authority, sending their sons to study with Islamic scholars. They were also, in the stipend system and in the social calculus of Umayyad Damascus, categorically inferior to Arab Muslims in ways that Islamic theology explicitly condemned.

The mawali's contribution to the caliphate's functioning was, by the early eighth century, indispensable and visibly so. The administrative machinery of the empire — the tax collection, the record-keeping, the translation of legal documents, the management of the postal system, the accounting of the treasury — was substantially operated by Iranian converts whose families had accumulated the administrative expertise that Arab tribal culture had not historically needed and could not quickly develop. The army in the eastern provinces, particularly in Khorasan where Iranian military manpower had been integrated into Arab military structures from an early stage, contained growing numbers of Iranian soldiers whose loyalty to the Islamic cause was real and whose effectiveness in the field was demonstrable. The Islamic scholarly community — the emerging class of Quran reciters, hadith transmitters, and legal scholars who were developing the institutional infrastructure of Islamic knowledge — included by the early eighth century a significant and growing Iranian component, men whose mastery of Arabic and Islamic learning was such that Arab scholars studied with them.

The social position of all these people — the administrator, the soldier, the scholar — was formally that of a client attached to an Arab tribe, a status marker that carried immediate material implications. In the stipend system, their share was smaller. In the social hierarchy of the mosque and the administrative office, their tribal attachment was visible in the way their names were recorded. In the marriage market, the preference for Arab lineage that characterized Umayyad social norms made intermarriage with Arab families more difficult despite the Islamic theological prohibition on racial discrimination. The gap between their actual contribution to the caliphate's functioning and their formal status within its social hierarchy was a structural grievance of the most precise kind: not vague oppression but identifiable, specific inequity between what Islamic theology promised and what Umayyad administration delivered.

The mawali's response to this grievance took several forms, and tracking those forms reveals the political geography of the coming transformation. Some found channels within the Umayyad system: converting to Islam fully, learning Arabic to native-speaker level, cultivating relationships with Arab patrons who could provide advancement within the existing hierarchy. The Barmakid family — Persians who served as administrators and eventually as viziers under the early Abbasids — followed something like this trajectory over multiple generations, accumulating influence through demonstrated administrative competence and careful relationship management. Others channeled their grievance into theological and intellectual forms: the early development of Sufi mysticism, the Mutazilite theological movement, and several strands of Shia religious thought all drew disproportionately on mawali scholars who found in rigorous Islamic learning both a form of equality with Arab scholars that the social hierarchy denied them and a language for critiquing the existing order from within its own premises. And some found their way into political opposition of a more direct kind, which would culminate in the Abbasid Revolution.

Section IV: Wealth Extraction — How Resources Flowed in the Umayyad Empire

The Fiscal Architecture of Conquest

The Umayyad caliphate's fiscal system was, like most aspects of its administration, a pragmatic improvisation that drew on both the existing Sassanid fiscal apparatus and the novel requirements of an Arab military state distributing conquest revenue among its supporters. Understanding how wealth actually flowed — from Iranian peasants and merchants and landowners through the administrative machinery to the Arab military elite in Damascus and the garrison cities — is essential for understanding what conversion actually meant in material terms, because the conversion economy was fundamentally a system in which the fiscal and the religious were inseparable.

The foundational distinction in the Umayyad fiscal system was between territory conquered by force and territory that had submitted voluntarily. Land conquered by force was technically fay — property of the Muslim community as a whole, administered by the state on the community's behalf. In practice, the Umayyad caliphs allowed most of this land to remain in the hands of its existing owners, collected as kharaj, because the alternative — redistributing conquered Iranian land to Arab settlers — would have required an administrative capacity the early caliphate did not possess and would have disrupted the agricultural production on which the tax base depended. The pragmatic decision to leave Iranian landowners in possession of their land while taxing it heavily was the foundation of the conversion economy: it preserved the Iranian elite's economic base while placing them under a fiscal regime that rewarded conversion.

The kharaj rates in the main agricultural provinces of the former Sassanid empire — Mesopotamia, Fars, Khuzistan, and the Iranian plateau — were set at levels that the Sassanid state had established through centuries of administrative experience with local agricultural productivity, adjusted upward in many cases to meet the caliphate's expanded military commitments. Contemporary estimates of kharaj revenue from Iraq alone — the most productive agricultural region — range from 100 to 135 million dirhams annually during peak Umayyad administrative efficiency, a figure that dwarfs the revenue from the Arabian peninsula itself and that underlines how completely the Islamic empire's fiscal base had shifted from its homeland to the conquered territories. This revenue sustained the stipend system that distributed shares to Arab soldiers, funded the construction of mosques and administrative buildings across the empire, and financed the campaigns of further conquest that the Umayyad caliphs prosecuted continuously across the seventh and early eighth centuries.

The individuals who actually collected this revenue — the administrators who assessed land, recorded harvests, calculated obligations, and transmitted funds through the hierarchy to Damascus — were, particularly in the eastern provinces, Iranians. The Sassanid administrative tradition had developed over four centuries a sophisticated apparatus for agricultural tax administration, and the Arab conquerors had neither the training nor the inclination to replace it immediately with something they would need to invent from scratch. Persian administrators who had served the Sassanid state, who knew the assessment records and the local conditions and the seasonal rhythms of agricultural production, were employed in the Umayyad fiscal machinery in very much the same roles they had performed for the previous dynasty, producing the peculiar situation — characteristic of many conquest regimes — in which the conquered administered the extraction of their own community's surplus for the benefit of the conquerors. This administrative continuity was one of the mechanisms through which the dehqan class maintained relevance and preserved its estates under the new order; it was also one of the mechanisms through which Persian administrative culture was transmitted into the Islamic state apparatus that would eventually become thoroughly Persian in character.

The Conversion Economy at Work: Specific Calculations, Specific Families

The material logic of the conversion economy is clearest when examined not at the level of imperial policy but at the level of the individual family calculation, and the historical record — fragmentary, filtered through Islamic-era sources, but not entirely silent — provides enough material to reconstruct the outlines of how those calculations proceeded.

Consider the situation of a dehqan family in Khorasan in, say, 710 CE — three generations after the conquest, in the reign of the Caliph al-Walid I. The family holds an estate that its ancestors had managed for the Sassanid state, collecting rents from the village communities on it and forwarding a portion to the imperial administration. The Arab conquest has changed who receives that portion — it goes now to the Arab governor in the garrison city of Merv rather than to the Sassanid treasury — but the family still holds the estate, still collects the rents, still adjudicates local disputes. The patriarch pays the jizya annually as a mark of his dhimmi status. His sons have learned enough Arabic to deal with the Arab administrative officials when necessary. The local fire temple still functions, maintained by the diminished but surviving Zoroastrian priestly community of the district.

The calculation this family faces is not theological in its primary terms. It is administrative and social. The eldest son, who will inherit the estate, needs to maintain relationships with the Arab administrative officials who set tax assessments and adjudicate property disputes. Those officials increasingly conduct their business in Arabic and within Islamic legal categories. The son who converts to Islam and studies Islamic law will be able to participate in those proceedings directly; the son who remains Zoroastrian will need an intermediary, will have less standing in the qadi court, and will depend on the goodwill of Muslim officials who may or may not choose to exercise it on his behalf. The commercial partnerships available to the family — credit from Muslim merchants, access to long-distance trade networks organized around Islamic institutional forms — are more readily available to a Muslim member of the family than to a Zoroastrian one. The marriage market increasingly favors Muslim identity as the Muslim community grows and as the social prestige associated with Arab connections becomes a factor in elite family networking.

None of these pressures, individually, is decisive. Taken together, across a generation, they compose a calculation in which conversion produces a specific, measurable improvement in the family's material and social position and non-conversion produces a specific, measurable deterioration relative to converting neighbors and competitors. The family that converted in 710 CE was not necessarily experiencing a spiritual transformation — though it may have been, and the historical record cannot reliably distinguish the spiritually sincere from the materially motivated because the categories were not as separate in lived experience as they are in retrospective analysis. What it was clearly experiencing was a rearrangement of the material landscape in which conversion made sense.

The scholarly families of Iranian cities faced a related but distinct version of this calculation, and their version is somewhat better documented because the Islamic biographical tradition — the tabaqat literature that recorded the lives of Islamic scholars — preserves traces of the Iranian intellectual elite's engagement with the new order. The Islamic scholarly community that was developing through the Umayyad period needed, among other things, people who could read and interpret the pre-Islamic traditions of Persian, Greek, and Indian learning that had been preserved in the cities of the former Sassanid empire. The translation and transmission of this knowledge into Arabic was a project that required scholars literate in Pahlavi, Syriac, and Sanskrit as well as Arabic, which meant it required people whose intellectual formation had

begun in non-Islamic educational contexts. Iranian scholars who converted and placed their existing expertise in the service of Islamic learning were performing the same accommodation as the administrative dehqans — preserving their essential social function (the production and transmission of knowledge) by redirecting it within the Islamic framework rather than against it.

The Jundishapur academy in Khuzistan is the most famous example of this dynamic. Jundishapur had been one of the Sassanid world's great centers of learning — particularly of medicine, astronomy, and philosophy — and its scholars had developed a curriculum that synthesized Persian, Greek, and Indian intellectual traditions across generations of institutional practice. After the Arab conquest, the academy continued to function under Arab patronage, its scholars translating their expertise into Arabic and transmitting it to Muslim students who came to study with them. The Bukhtishu family, Nestorian Christians who served as court physicians across multiple generations of both Umayyad and Abbasid caliphs, were the most prominent representatives of this Jundishapur tradition; their family's service to successive Islamic dynasties across two centuries represents a particularly clear case of an intellectual elite maintaining its social function by demonstrating indispensability to the new order. The Jundishapur scholars who converted to Islam over the Umayyad and early Abbasid periods brought with them not just their individual expertise but their institutional networks, their libraries, and their pedagogical traditions, which became the foundation of the Islamic scientific tradition that would flourish in Baghdad under Abbasid patronage.

The Limits of Umayyad Extraction: When the System Generates Its Own Opposition

The Umayyad fiscal and administrative system was effective at extracting wealth from the conquered territories. It was significantly less effective at maintaining the political consent that makes extraction sustainable over the long term, because its governing contradiction — the universalist theology of Islamic equality and the particularist practice of Arab ethnic privilege — generated grievances at every social level that it touched.

The Arab soldiers of the garrison cities, who had expected their conquest participation to produce permanent elevation above the conquered population, found themselves competing with increasingly capable mawali converts in administrative positions they had assumed would be theirs exclusively. The Iranian converts of the mawali class, who had accepted the costs and social disruptions of conversion on the premise of gaining the promised equality with Arab Muslims, found that equality perpetually deferred by administrative practice. The remaining Zoroastrian population, whose accommodation with the new order had been premised on the stability of the dhimmi framework, found that framework applied inconsistently and increasingly exploitatively as the caliphate's fiscal needs grew. And the Arab ruling elite in Damascus, presiding over an empire that stretched from Spain to Central Asia, found that the administrative demands of governing that empire required them to depend ever more completely on the Persian and other non-Arab specialists who had made themselves indispensable while simultaneously resenting that dependence.

The provincial governance of Khorasan in the early eighth century illustrates the system's instability at its eastern edge, where the conversion economy was generating the most intense pressures. Khorasan — the broad northeastern Iranian province encompassing what is now eastern Iran, southern Turkmenistan, and northern Afghanistan — was the most heavily garrisoned of the eastern provinces, with a large Arab settler population that had arrived across the decades following the conquest and had intermarried with Iranian families to a degree that

made the boundary between Arab and Persian identity genuinely porous. The Arab settlers of Khorasan had, in many cases, substantially Persianized across two or three generations — speaking Persian in their daily lives, adopting Iranian social customs, cultivating relationships with Iranian dehqan families through marriage and commercial partnership — while maintaining their Arab tribal identity for purposes of the stipend distribution. The mawali of Khorasan were simultaneously the most numerous, the most educated, the most economically integrated, and the most politically frustrated of the caliphate's non-Arab Muslim population.

The governorship of Hajjaj ibn Yusuf, who administered the eastern provinces from 694 to 714 CE as the representative of the Caliph Abd al-Malik and his son al-Walid I, represents the Umayyad system at its most efficient and most politically costly. Hajjaj was an administrator of exceptional talent and exceptional brutality whose management of the eastern provinces combined rigorous tax collection, suppression of provincial autonomy, aggressive military campaigning into Central Asia, and systematic reassertion of Arab privilege against the claims of mawali converts. His reinstatement of jizya collection from converts who had previously been exempted was the most politically explosive of his policies — a direct administrative reversal of the theological promise that conversion would change a person's fiscal status. The resentment this generated in the mawali population of Khorasan was both intense and long-lived, surviving Hajjaj's death in 714 and contributing directly to the political mobilization that would produce the Abbasid Revolution thirty years later.

Section V: Information Control — Who Controlled the Story of the Conquest

The Arabicization of Knowledge

Among the most consequential administrative decisions of the Umayyad period was the Arabicization of the official written record under Abd al-Malik in the 690s. The administrative shift — replacing Greek in the western provinces and Middle Persian (Pahlavi) in the eastern provinces with Arabic as the language of official documentation — was motivated by practical administrative logic: a unified language for an empire that stretched across multiple previous linguistic zones would reduce the translation costs and interpretive ambiguities that plagued inter-provincial communication. Its consequences for the information landscape of the eastern provinces were profound and largely irreversible.

Pahlavi had been the language not merely of Sassanid bureaucracy but of Sassanid intellectual and religious life. The Zoroastrian scriptures, the Avesta, were preserved and transmitted in Avestan — an even more ancient Iranian tongue — but the commentaries, theological elaborations, administrative records, and literary texts that constituted the working intellectual life of the Sassanid educated class were in Pahlavi. When Arabic replaced Pahlavi in the administrative sphere, the institutional infrastructure that had sustained Pahlavi literacy began to erode. The scribal schools that had trained Sassanid administrators in the language and conventions of official Pahlavi writing were not replaced by Arabic equivalents overnight, but they were no longer producing graduates whose skills were valued in the dominant administrative system. The transmission of Pahlavi literacy became a function of the Zoroastrian religious community alone — and as that community shrank through conversion, the pool of people capable of reading, writing, and teaching Pahlavi shrank with it.

The consequences were visible within two to three generations of Abd al-Malik's administrative reform. Texts that had been regularly copied and circulated in the Sassanid administrative world ceased to be copied, because the scriptoria and educated readers that had sustained their circulation were disappearing. The pre-Islamic Persian historical and literary tradition — the royal chronicles, the administrative records, the collections of wisdom literature, the astronomical and medical texts — was not immediately destroyed. It was progressively abandoned, because the people who could read it were becoming fewer while the people who needed to read it in order to participate in the dominant administrative culture of the caliphate were choosing to invest their educational energy in Arabic instead. Some of this tradition was eventually preserved by being translated into Arabic, which saved the intellectual content at the cost of the linguistic and cultural form. Much of it was lost entirely, because neither Arabic translation nor continued Pahlavi transmission occurred before the transmission chain broke.

The Zoroastrian religious community's awareness of this process is documented in the defensive compilations that Zoroastrian priests produced from the ninth century onward. The Denkard — a massive encyclopedic compilation of Zoroastrian theology, ethics, and practice assembled over the ninth and tenth centuries — was explicitly a preservation project, an attempt by priests who recognized that the tradition was being lost to commit as much of it as possible to written form before the transmission capacity of the community fell below the level needed to sustain it. The urgency of the compilation effort — its scale, its comprehensiveness, its evident awareness that it was recording things at risk of disappearing — is itself a form of evidence. It tells us that by the ninth century, the Zoroastrian priests knew they were losing, not through martyrdom or active persecution but through the slower violence of cultural marginalization and demographic contraction. The Denkard is both a monument to a great religious tradition and a record of its impending extinction in the land of its origin.

How the Conquest Story Was Told — and What It Omitted

The historiography of the Arab conquest of Persia was written almost entirely by Muslim scholars working within the Islamic framework, decades and in most cases centuries after the events they described. The futuh literature — the accounts of the Muslim conquests — presents the campaigns as divinely guided military operations in which Islamic faith produced victories that military logic alone could not explain. Persian resistance is portrayed as the doomed struggle of a civilization that had been weighed in the cosmic balance and found wanting; the Sassanid empire's fall is interpreted through Quranic categories as the punishment of a people who had rejected divine guidance and the reward of a community that had embraced it. The theological framework is not applied externally to an otherwise neutral account; it is the framework within which the entire narrative is organized, so that the material mechanisms of conquest — the specific military tactics, the specific administrative arrangements, the specific negotiations between Arab commanders and Persian local elites — appear as incidental details within a story whose meaning is already determined by its conclusion.

Reading these sources against their grain — attending to what the incidental details reveal rather than what the narrative frame asserts — produces a different picture of the conquest and its immediate aftermath. The futuh accounts, despite their theological scaffolding, preserve traces of the actual negotiations through which Arab authority was established across the Iranian plateau: the arrangements made with Persian governors who submitted before being militarily defeated, the terms offered to cities that opened their gates, the agreements with dehqan families who agreed to maintain agricultural production and tax collection in exchange for retention of their estates. These incidental records of material arrangement are more historically reliable than the theological narrative frame precisely because they serve the

narrative's purpose only as background detail, not as its central claim. A Muslim historian writing about the triumph of God's armies had no reason to falsify the administrative terms under which a particular Persian city submitted; those terms were peripheral to his main argument. Their incidental preservation is therefore more trustworthy than details that would have served the narrative's theological purposes directly.

What the Islamic historical tradition systematically omitted — not through deception but through the operation of its own organizing assumptions — was the perspective of the conquered. Zoroastrian accounts of the conquest and its aftermath do not exist in any substantial form, because the social collapse of the Zoroastrian community was precisely the collapse of its institutional capacity to produce and transmit such accounts. The texts that Zoroastrian priests compiled in the ninth and tenth centuries — the defensive compilations of a shrinking community — are almost entirely theological and ritualistic rather than historical; they are concerned with preserving religious practice, not with narrating political events. The few Zoroastrian texts that touch on the historical experience of the conquest treat it primarily through the lens of apocalyptic expectation: the rule of the demons (divs) that the Zoroastrian tradition predicted before the final triumph of truth. This theological framing is the Zoroastrian tradition's equivalent of the Islamic futuh literature — a way of making unbearable events comprehensible within an existing framework of cosmic meaning — but it provides even less incidental historical detail than the Islamic sources, because the Zoroastrian community's administrative and institutional capacity for historical documentation had been destroyed by the very events it was trying to narrate.

The consequence for the historical analyst is that the Islamization of Persia must be reconstructed primarily from sources produced by the winning side, supplemented by the incidental details those sources preserve, the material evidence of archaeological and numismatic research, and the onomastic data that Bulliet's conversion rate study extracted from the biographical dictionary tradition. This is a significant constraint. The experience of being converted — the felt texture of the material pressures, the family conversations about whether to submit or resist, the specific moments of decision that Bulliet's S-curve aggregates into demographic statistics — is largely invisible. What remains is the aggregate pattern, the administrative record, and the theological narrative of the victors. Reading that record honestly requires holding the narrative frame at arm's length while attending carefully to what the details reveal.

The Heresiographers and the Record of Resistance

One category of Islamic sources deserves particular attention for what it preserves of non-Islamic Iranian religious and intellectual life: the heresiographical tradition, the genre of Islamic scholarly writing that catalogued and analyzed non-Islamic and heterodox beliefs for the purpose of refuting them. Works like Ibn al-Nadim's Fihrist (composed around 988 CE), which catalogued the books and intellectual traditions of all the communities the Islamic world had encountered, and the theological works of scholars like al-Shahrastani and al-Biruni, which documented non-Islamic religious systems with ethnographic precision, preserved substantial information about Zoroastrian theology, ritual, and practice that the Zoroastrian community itself was losing the capacity to transmit. The irony is notable: the most detailed accounts of what Zoroastrianism actually believed and practiced, outside the Zoroastrian defensive compilations themselves, are found in Islamic scholarly works written to demonstrate why Islam was superior to its competitors.

Al-Biruni, the eleventh-century polymath from Khwarazm who wrote in Arabic while being culturally Persian, produced a description of Zoroastrian religious practice in his Chronology of Ancient Nations that combines genuine scholarly curiosity with the confident superiority of someone writing from within the dominant tradition. His account of the Nowruz festival — the Persian New Year, rooted in Zoroastrian cosmology — describes a celebration that was, by his time, being observed by Persian Muslims as a cultural tradition rather than a religious one, its Zoroastrian theological content preserved in scholarly memory while its social form persisted in popular practice. This transformation of a Zoroastrian religious festival into a Persian cultural festival that Muslims could participate in is one of the mechanisms through which pre-Islamic Iranian culture survived the conversion: elements of Zoroastrian practice that could be detached from their theological grounding and recoded as cultural heritage rather than religious obligation were preserved through the transition; elements that were inseparably theological — the fire rituals, the purity regulations, the priestly ceremonies — were not.

The accounts of anti-Islamic resistance movements preserved in Islamic heresiographical and historical literature are particularly valuable for what they reveal about the forms Iranian opposition to the conversion economy took. These movements — Mazdakite revivals, explicitly anti-Islamic prophecy movements, neo-Zoroastrian resistance in the mountains of Gilan and Daylam — were documented by Islamic scholars primarily as examples of heresy and rebellion that had been correctly suppressed. But the documentation, however unsympathetic, records that they existed, that they attracted significant followings in specific regions and social contexts, and that they articulated their resistance in terms of Iranian identity and Zoroastrian belief rather than merely political opposition to Arab governance. They are the suppression shadow: their documented existence in Islamic sources, despite those sources' interest in minimizing their significance, confirms that the conversion was not as smooth or as welcome as the dominant narrative suggested.

Continues in Part Three: The Revolution — The Abbasid Uprising, Persian Appropriation of Islam, and the Transformation of the Caliphate, 744–800 CE

THE CONQUERED CONQUERORS

Elite Power, the Conversion Economy, and the Transformation of Iranian Civilization, 224–1010 CE

PART THREE

The Revolution: The Abbasid Uprising, Persian Appropriation of Islam, and the Transformation of the Caliphate, 744–833 CE

The Abbasid Revolution: What It Was and What It Was Not

The Standard Account and Its Distortions

The Abbasid Revolution of 747-750 CE — the uprising that destroyed the Umayyad dynasty and replaced it with a new caliphal house whose reign would last, in increasingly attenuated form, until the Mongol sack of Baghdad in 1258 — is one of the most consequential political events in the history of the Islamic world, and one of the most persistently misunderstood. The Islamic historical tradition that recorded it was the tradition of the victors, and the Abbasid dynasty that patronized Islamic scholarship for the next five centuries had an obvious interest in how the revolution was remembered. The account that tradition produced was one of divinely guided restoration: the Umayyads had corrupted the Islamic caliphate by making it an Arab dynasty rather than a community of the faithful, and the Abbasids, descended from the Prophet's uncle Abbas, had restored legitimate Islamic governance by overthrowing that corruption. The revolution in this account is a religious event — the vindication of Islamic justice against Umayyad impiety.

This account is not false in all its particulars. The theological grievances that the revolutionary movement articulated were genuine grievances, sincerely felt by many who joined the cause. The Umayyad caliphate had maintained a governing structure that systematically violated the egalitarian premises of Islamic theology, and the Abbasid movement's promises of justice and equality within the Islamic community addressed real injuries experienced by real people. But the revolution's theological framing was also, simultaneously, the political language through which a coalition of very specific material interests — Iranian converts denied equality, Arab settlers in Khorasan who had become Persian in practice while remaining Arab in stipend calculations, Shia partisans whose theological objections to Umayyad legitimacy mapped precisely onto their political exclusion — expressed and organized a struggle whose ultimate stakes were the control of the most powerful state in the medieval world. Understanding the revolution requires holding both the theological sincerity and the material calculation in view simultaneously, neither reducing it to cynical manipulation nor accepting the theological narrative at face value.

What the revolution was, at the level of its structural mechanics, was a conquest of the caliphate from the inside — performed by people who were already Muslims, already within the system, already fluent in the language and categories of Islamic governance, and who used that fluency to seize the state apparatus that Arab identity had previously monopolized. The Persians and Persianized Arabs who made the revolution did not reject Islam. They claimed it — claimed that their version of Islam, their interpretation of what the caliphate should be, their understanding of Islamic justice, was more authentically Islamic than the Umayyad version that had excluded and exploited them. This is the move that makes the Abbasid Revolution the most analytically interesting moment in the Islamization of Persia: not a rejection of the conqueror's religion but an appropriation of it so complete that the conquered eventually used it to conquer the conquerors.

The Coalition: Three Grievances, One Black Banner

The revolutionary movement that coalesced under Abbasid leadership in the early 740s was not a unified ideological movement with a single social base. It was a coalition of groups whose

material interests and theological grievances happened to converge on the same target — Umayyad power — without being identical in their ultimate goals or their vision of what should replace it. Understanding who was in the coalition, what each component wanted, and how those different interests were held together under the black banners of the revolution is essential for understanding both the revolution's success and the tensions that would mark the Abbasid caliphate it produced.

The first and numerically largest component was the mawali of Khorasan — the Iranian converts to Islam who had spent a century accumulating the specific grievances described in the previous part: the jizya collected from converts, the stipend system that maintained Arab privilege, the administrative Arabicization that disadvantaged everyone who had not been born into Arabic-speaking culture, the perpetual gap between the theological equality that Islam promised and the material inequality that Umayyad governance delivered. This community was large, geographically concentrated in the most politically strategic region of the eastern caliphate, increasingly educated in Islamic learning, and organized through the institutional networks of mosques and religious study circles that the Islamic community provided. It was also, by the 740s, several generations removed from the original moment of conversion, which meant that its members' Islamic identity was not a recent accommodation to political pressure but a genuine and deeply held religious commitment. They were not people cynically performing Islamic practice to gain material advantages; they were Muslims who were angry that the Islamic state was failing to honor the commitments their faith said it owed them.

The second component was the Arab settlers of Khorasan — a population that had undergone, over three to four generations of residence in the eastern provinces, a degree of cultural Persianization that complicated any simple identification with the Arab metropolitan elite in Damascus. These men carried Arab tribal names and drew Arab stipends, but many spoke Persian in their daily lives, married into Iranian families, ate Iranian food, participated in Iranian social customs, and in some cases maintained relationships with Zoroastrian neighbors that the more rigorous Islamic scholars of Damascus would have found troubling. Their relationship with the Umayyad court was one of increasing alienation: they felt that the caliphate's fiscal and political machinery was run by and for the Arab families of Syria and Iraq, that the enormous revenues extracted from Khorasan flowed west to benefit people who had never fought for the eastern provinces, and that their own claims — based on their military service and their role in maintaining the frontier — were systematically discounted. They were Arabs who had become functionally Persian enough to share Persian material grievances without being Persian enough to lose their formal Arab status, a liminal position that made them ideal recruits for a movement that promised to reorder the caliphate's internal hierarchy.

The third component was the Shia movement — the community of Muslims who held that legitimate authority in the Islamic community belonged to the descendants of the Prophet through his cousin and son-in-law Ali, and that the Umayyads were not merely unjust administrators but illegitimate rulers whose overthrow was a religious obligation. The Shia community in the 740s was not yet the institutionally developed religious tradition it would become; it was a broad and somewhat diffuse sentiment among Muslims who shared the conviction that the caliphate had been stolen from its proper heirs at Ali's death in 661 and had been administered ever since by people whose authority was morally and theologically invalid. This sentiment was particularly strong in Iraq, where Ali had been based, and in Khorasan, where a significant Persian Muslim population had found in Shia religious identity both a vehicle for expressing devotion to the Prophet's family and a framework for understanding their own exclusion from Umayyad privilege. The Abbasids, whose claim to legitimacy rested on descent from the Prophet's uncle rather than from Ali himself, were not strictly Shia, but they

successfully recruited Shia support by maintaining studied ambiguity about who, precisely, among the Prophet's family the revolution was fighting for.

Holding this coalition together required the organizational genius that the revolutionary movement found in its Khorasani leadership, and specifically in the figure of Abu Muslim — one of the most consequential and most enigmatic men of the eighth century. Abu Muslim's origins are genuinely obscure: the Islamic sources record competing accounts of his background, some making him an Arab client, others suggesting Iranian descent, the uncertainty itself perhaps reflecting deliberate obscuring of a biography that did not fit neatly into the categories the Abbasid narrative required. What is clear is that he arrived in Khorasan as an Abbasid agent around 745 CE, built a military organization from the disparate elements of the revolutionary coalition with extraordinary speed and skill, and launched the open revolt in June 747 by unfurling the black banners of the revolution at the village of Safizanj. Within three years, the Umayyad caliphate had been destroyed.

Abu Muslim and the Black Banners: The Military Mechanics of Revolution

The military campaign of the Abbasid Revolution between 747 and 750 CE is one of the most rapid and complete overthrows of an established empire in the medieval period, and its speed requires explanation beyond the theological framing that Islamic sources provide. The revolutionary armies did not succeed because God favored them, though the participants believed this sincerely. They succeeded because the Umayyad military structure in the eastern provinces had been progressively hollowed out by the same contradictions that had produced the revolutionary coalition, and because Abu Muslim proved a military organizer of exceptional capacity who understood how to convert diffuse grievance into disciplined military force.

The Umayyad armies in Khorasan were the product of the same ethnic hierarchy that governed the rest of the caliphate's administration. Arab tribal units held the formal military positions and received the formal military stipends; mawali recruits who actually filled out the army's operational capacity were organized as auxiliaries with lesser formal status and lesser pay. This structure produced armies that were on paper Arab-commanded but operationally dependent on Iranian military manpower — a dependency that the Arab commanders resisted acknowledging and the Iranian soldiers resented not being acknowledged for. When Abu Muslim began recruiting in Khorasan, he was drawing on a pool of men who already knew how to fight, who were already organized through the loose structures of village and tribal community, and who had accumulated specific, articulable grievances against the commanders they were being asked to continue serving. The defection of Umayyad military units to the revolutionary cause as the campaign progressed was not simply the desertion of demoralized troops; it was the transfer of men who had already concluded that the Abbasid promise of equal treatment within the Islamic community was worth fighting for.

Abu Muslim's operational method combined military force with political management in ways that reveal sophisticated strategic thinking. He did not attempt to hold territory as he advanced westward from Khorasan; he moved quickly, keeping the Umayyad garrisons off-balance and preventing them from concentrating against him. He maintained the coalition's internal cohesion by enforcing discipline — Islamic sources record that he executed soldiers who looted or violated the rules of conduct he established — which served both the practical purpose of maintaining troop effectiveness and the political purpose of demonstrating that the revolutionary movement was what it claimed to be: a force fighting for Islamic justice rather than simply replacing one set of exploiters with another. This demonstration of principled conduct was itself

a form of political communication, addressed to the populations the army was passing through and designed to convert passive non-resistance into active support.

The decisive military engagement was the Battle of the Zab, fought in January 750 CE on the banks of the Great Zab River in what is now northern Iraq. The last Umayyad caliph, Marwan II, had assembled the largest army he could muster from the remaining loyal forces of his disintegrating empire. The battle lasted most of a day and ended in the complete collapse of the Umayyad forces. Marwan fled southward into Egypt, where he was killed a few months later. His body was found, according to the sources, with a copy of the Psalms in his pocket — a detail whose authenticity is uncertain but whose symbolic resonance is clear: the last Umayyad caliph, who had maintained the Arab Muslim empire against its Iranian-led challengers, died as a fugitive carrying the scripture of one of the traditions his dynasty had governed as dhimmis.

What followed the Battle of the Zab was a systematic extermination of the Umayyad family — nearly complete, conducted with a thoroughness that went beyond military necessity and into the territory of deliberate elimination. The Abbasid commanders invited surviving Umayyad princes to a dinner of reconciliation at Abu Futrus in Palestine, then had them killed at the table. Other family members were hunted down across the empire's provinces. The sole significant survivor, Abd al-Rahman, escaped to Spain — too remote from the Abbasid center of power to be worth the cost of pursuit — where he established the Emirate of Cordoba and the Umayyad dynasty's Spanish continuation. The extermination of the Umayyad family in the east was not merely vengeance; it was the elimination of any possible legitimate alternative to Abbasid rule, the closing off of any political future for the defeated cause. It was also a demonstration that the new regime understood the military logic that had governed the old one: when force settles the question, it settles it completely.

Baghdad: The Architecture of a New Order

The Abbasid caliphs' decision to build a new capital rather than occupy the Umayyad capital of Damascus was not merely symbolic, though it was intensely symbolic. Damascus was a Syrian Arab city, embedded in the social and cultural world of the Umayyad dynasty's base of support, physically remote from the Iranian heartland that had produced the revolution and whose administrative and military resources would underpin the new order. A caliphate that claimed to represent the universal Islamic community rather than an Arab dynasty needed a capital that was not the capital of an Arab dynasty, and it needed to be close to the Iranian administrative talent and the Mesopotamian agricultural wealth that were the empire's real operational foundations.

The Caliph al-Mansur chose a site on the Tigris River for his new capital, commissioned in 762 CE and completed within four years — a feat of construction that required, according to medieval estimates, approximately 100,000 workers drawn from across the empire. The site was barely twenty miles from Ctesiphon, the old Sassanid capital whose ruins were still visible on the opposite bank of the river. The proximity was almost certainly deliberate. Madinat al-Salam — City of Peace — was the city's official name, but it became universally known as Baghdad, from a Persian toponym meaning approximately 'gift of God.' The Persian name for a city built by an Arab dynasty to replace the Arab capital of an Arab empire is itself a small emblem of what the Abbasid caliphate was becoming.

Al-Mansur's Round City — the extraordinary circular urban design that became the original Baghdad — was planned with an architectural logic that made the caliphate's new self-understanding physically visible. At its center stood the caliph's palace and the great

mosque, the two institutions whose relationship defined the Abbasid political theology: the caliph as both temporal ruler and guardian of Islamic legitimacy, the mosque as the institution through which that legitimacy was communicated to the population. Radiating outward from this center were the administrative offices, the markets, and the residential quarters that housed the caliphate's governing apparatus — an apparatus that, from the first days of the new capital's existence, was substantially Persian in its personnel, its language of internal operation, and its administrative procedures.

The Iranian administrators who staffed the Abbasid bureaucracy were not, in most cases, new arrivals. They were the descendants of the dehqan families and urban administrative clans who had managed the Sassanid state, survived the Umayyad period by demonstrating indispensability, and converted to Islam in sufficient numbers and over sufficient time to be genuinely Muslim rather than nominally so. Their children and grandchildren had grown up within the Islamic educational system, had studied Quran and hadith alongside the Persian literary and administrative traditions their families preserved, and were consequently bicultural in ways that made them uniquely useful to a caliphate that needed both Islamic legitimacy and Persian administrative expertise. The Abbasid revolution had created the political conditions under which this bicultural class could fully emerge, because it had eliminated the ethnic hierarchy that had constrained their advancement under the Umayyads.

The Barmakids: A Persian Family at the Center of Islamic Power

No family illustrates the Abbasid transformation more concretely than the Barmakids — the Iranian dynasty of administrators and viziers who dominated Abbasid governance for nearly half a century before their sudden, total destruction in 803 CE. Their story is the story of the Persian administrative elite's accommodation with Islamic power taken to its furthest point, and their fall is the story of what happens when an administrative family accumulates enough power to threaten the military supremacy that ultimately governs every political system.

The Barmakid family's origins were in the Buddhist monasteries of Balkh in Khorasan — the patriarch Barmak had been, before the Arab conquest, a hereditary administrator of a major Buddhist shrine, a role that combined religious responsibility with the management of substantial institutional resources. The family's conversion to Islam in the wake of the Abbasid Revolution was not forced; it was the rational choice of an administratively talented family that recognized the new order and positioned itself to serve it. Khalid ibn Barmak, the first of the family to achieve significant position under the Abbasids, served as a military and administrative official in the early Abbasid period; his son Yahya ibn Khalid became the tutor of the future Caliph Harun al-Rashid and, after Harun's accession in 786, was appointed as his vizier with a degree of authority over the caliphate's administration that contemporaries described as effectively making him co-ruler. Yahya's sons Fadl and Ja'far served alongside their father, Fadl as a governor and military commander, Ja'far as Harun's intimate companion and the practical manager of the central administration.

The Barmakids' administrative achievement during the late eighth century was the construction of the most sophisticated governmental apparatus the Islamic world had yet produced — a bureaucracy that drew on Persian administrative traditions, adapted them to Islamic legal categories, and produced a state capable of governing an empire stretching from Morocco to Central Asia with a degree of efficiency and internal coherence that the Umayyad system had never approached. The diwan al-kharaj — the land tax bureau — was reorganized under Barmakid supervision along lines that drew explicitly on the Sassanid fiscal tradition. The postal system (barid), which served both communication and intelligence functions for the caliphate,

was expanded and rationalized. The translation movement — the massive project of rendering Greek, Persian, Sanskrit, and Syriac texts into Arabic — received Barmakid patronage that made Baghdad under Harun al-Rashid the intellectual center of the medieval world, a city where scholars of every tradition gathered and where the accumulated knowledge of multiple civilizations was being systematically absorbed into the Arabic-Islamic framework.

The Barmakids' personal conduct combined Islamic observance with Persian cultural patronage in ways that embodied the synthesis the Abbasid period was producing. Harun's court at Baghdad was simultaneously a caliphal court organized around Islamic ritual — the Friday prayers, the pilgrimage to Mecca, the public observance of Islamic law — and a continuation of the Sassanid court tradition of literary patronage, philosophical discussion, wine drinking (conducted in private, away from the formal requirements of Islamic public life), and the cultivation of poetry in both Arabic and Persian. The tension between these two aspects of Abbasid court culture was not experienced as hypocrisy by its participants but as the natural expression of a civilization that had synthesized two great traditions without fully resolving their differences. Harun himself performed the hajj to Mecca on nine occasions — an extraordinary devotional commitment by a man who also, if the literary sources are to be trusted, maintained a court of remarkable worldly sophistication.

The fall of the Barmakids in 803 CE was sudden, total, and never fully explained by the sources, which suggests that the explanation involves considerations that the official record was not designed to preserve. In January of that year, Harun ordered the arrest of Ja'far, his closest companion, and had him executed the same night. Yahya and Fadl were arrested and imprisoned; the family's vast properties were confiscated; the network of clients and subordinates they had built across the caliphate's administration was dismantled. The reasons offered by medieval historians range from personal — Ja'far had allegedly conducted a secret affair with Harun's sister Abbasa — to political, involving accusations of Shia sympathies or pro-Persian sentiment that threatened caliphal authority. None of these explanations is entirely satisfying, and the most plausible interpretation is structural rather than biographical: the Barmakids had accumulated so much administrative power, so extensive a network of personal loyalties throughout the imperial bureaucracy, and so much personal wealth that they had crossed the threshold at which a caliph who understood where power ultimately resided — in military force — could no longer tolerate their position. They had become too powerful to be safely kept and too embedded to be safely reduced. Harun solved the problem the way rulers have always solved it: by using force before the threatened party could use it first.

The Barmakid fall is analytically significant beyond the drama of a single family's destruction. It illustrates with particular clarity the structural dynamic that governed the relationship between administrative elites and military power throughout the Abbasid period. Persian administrative talent was indispensable to the caliphate's functioning; Persian administrators could accumulate enormous influence through that indispensability; but the military force that ultimately guaranteed the caliphate's authority belonged to the caliph, and the caliph's willingness to use that force against his own most powerful servants was the final check on administrative power that no bureaucratic accumulation could overcome. The Barmakids learned this lesson definitively. Their successors drew the appropriate conclusion: administrative influence was valuable, but it was never safe to accumulate it beyond the point at which the caliph might feel threatened. This implicit limit on Persian administrative ambition shaped the political culture of the Abbasid court for generations.

The Translation Movement: When Knowledge Changes Hands

Among the Abbasid revolution's most consequential consequences was the creation of conditions under which the accumulated intellectual heritage of the ancient world — Greek philosophy and science, Persian administrative and literary tradition, Indian mathematics and astronomy, Syriac theological and medical scholarship — was systematically translated into Arabic and absorbed into the Islamic intellectual framework. The Translation Movement, which reached its peak under the caliphs al-Mansur, Harun al-Rashid, and especially al-Mamun (r. 813-833), was one of the great intellectual projects of human history, and it was also, simultaneously, an exercise in information control of the most sophisticated kind: the reframing of all significant human knowledge within an Arabic-Islamic epistemic framework that made Arabic literacy the universal requirement for participation in the highest level of intellectual life.

The institutional vehicle for this project was the Bayt al-Hikma — the House of Wisdom — established in Baghdad under al-Mamun's patronage around 830 CE. The House of Wisdom was simultaneously a library, a translation bureau, an astronomical observatory, and a center of scholarly discussion that brought together translators, scientists, philosophers, and mathematicians from across the empire's ethnic and religious communities. The translators who did the actual work of converting texts from Greek, Pahlavi, Sanskrit, and Syriac into Arabic were predominantly Christians and Zoroastrians who had maintained literacy in the source languages that Arabic-educated Muslim scholars had not — the Nestorian Christian families of Jundishapur, the Zoroastrian scholarly communities who had preserved Sassanid astronomical and medical knowledge, the Syriac Christian monasteries where Aristotle's logical works had been studied for centuries. These translators were not converts being rewarded for their conversion; they were specialists being employed for their expertise, compensated generously by caliphal patronage that understood the value of what they could provide.

The translation movement's intellectual consequences were genuine and enormous. The recovery of Greek philosophical and scientific texts through Arabic translation — Aristotle's logic and natural philosophy, Ptolemy's astronomy, Euclid's mathematics, Galen's medicine — created the intellectual foundation for the Islamic Golden Age that would produce al-Kindi, al-Farabi, Ibn Sina, and al-Biruni. The Persian astronomical and administrative traditions contributed chronological systems, calendrical knowledge, and administrative models that shaped the Abbasid state's self-understanding. Indian mathematics, transmitted through Arabic translations of Sanskrit texts, provided the numerical system — including the zero — that would eventually transform European mathematics when transmitted westward through Islamic Spain. By any measure, the project was an intellectual achievement of the first order.

But the translation movement also had a specific political function that its intellectual achievements should not obscure. By translating all significant knowledge into Arabic and housing the translated corpus in Baghdad under caliphal patronage, the Abbasid state was performing a kind of intellectual conquest that complemented the military conquest of a century earlier. Knowledge that had existed in multiple linguistic traditions, accessible to scholars in those traditions without reference to Arabic or Islamic institutional authority, was being reconstituted as Arabic knowledge, housed in a caliphal institution, accessible through Arabic literacy, interpreted through Islamic categories. The Persian astronomical tradition survived the translation movement — but as Arabic-language astronomy, available to Persian-speaking scholars only through the Arabic translation and within the Islamic scholarly framework. The Greek philosophical tradition survived — but as Islamic philosophy (falsafa), read and debated within a framework that had to negotiate its relationship to Quranic revelation at every step. The translation movement did not destroy the source traditions; it absorbed them, which was simultaneously more generous than destruction and more effective as information control,

because absorption within the dominant framework removes the source tradition's capacity to serve as an independent alternative.

The Abbasid Caliphate's Persian Character: What Changed and What Did Not

The transformation of the caliphate from an Arab institution centered in Damascus to a Persian-inflected institution centered in Baghdad was real and consequential, but it operated within limits that the revolution itself had established and that the Abbasid dynasty maintained with some consistency. The caliphate remained Islamic — this was non-negotiable, because the Islamic identity of the institution was both its legitimating claim and the basis of the coalition that had brought it to power. The Arabic language remained the language of religious scholarship, of legal administration, and of formal court communication — Persian recovered its place as a literary and eventually administrative language, but Arabic's primacy in the religious and legal spheres was never seriously challenged. And the Abbasid caliphs themselves maintained the forms of Islamic piety — the pilgrimage, the Friday prayers, the public observance of Islamic law — that their legitimacy required.

Within these limits, the Persianization of the caliphate's administrative culture proceeded rapidly and comprehensively. The secretarial class — the kuttab, the educated scribes who actually drafted the documents, correspondence, and administrative orders through which the caliphate governed — was overwhelmingly Persian in cultural formation, educated in the Persian adab tradition (the literary and ethical culture of the educated man) even when writing in Arabic. Their Arabic prose style drew on Persian rhetorical models; their collections of wisdom literature translated and adapted Persian royal advice literature (the 'mirrors for princes' genre) into Arabic forms; their organizational conventions for bureaucratic procedure were adaptations of Sassanid administrative practice. The caliphal court's ceremonial — the elaborate protocols of audience, the physical staging of the caliph's majesty, the use of curtains and barriers to separate the ruler from ordinary petitioners — was derived from Sassanid court tradition rather than from early Arabian practice, in which the Prophet and his immediate successors had been notably accessible to ordinary believers.

The cuisine, the architecture, the garden design, the musical traditions, and the literary culture of the Abbasid court were all substantially Iranian in their aesthetic foundations, overlaid with Islamic forms that gave them legitimacy within the new order. Persian gardens — the pairi-daeza, the walled enclosure of cultivated plants and water features that had been a Sassanid aristocratic pleasure — became the model for Abbasid court gardens and eventually, through Arabic, gave the English language the word 'paradise.' Persian poetic forms — the qasida, the ghazal — were adapted into Arabic and then reclaimed by Persian-language poets writing in the new literary tradition that the Abbasid synthesis was producing. Persian philosophical traditions were translated, absorbed, and continued within the framework of Islamic falsafa. At every level of cultural production, the Abbasid period represented the absorption of the Persian tradition into the Islamic framework — which is to say, the survival of the Persian tradition through transformation rather than its preservation in unchanged form.

The Ulama: A New Interpretive Class and Its Relationship to Power

The Islamic scholarly class — the ulama, literally the learned ones — who emerged as the Abbasid period's primary interpretive specialists were a fundamentally different kind of institution from the Zoroastrian magi they had replaced, and the differences had consequences for the

relationship between belief-based authority and state power that would shape Iranian and Islamic civilization for centuries. Understanding those differences requires examining not just what the ulama believed and taught but how they were organized, how they were trained, how they were compensated, and how they related to the caliphal authority that both patronized and constrained them.

The magi had been, as described in Part One, a hereditary interpretive class with an institutional infrastructure — fire temples, endowments, priestly hierarchies — that was partially independent of state authority. Their authority rested on lineage, on specialized ritual knowledge transmitted within priestly families across generations, and on the physical presence of the sacred fires that they alone could maintain. This institutional independence was real, though ultimately limited by the fact that the magi could not field armies. The ulama were organized on entirely different principles. Islamic scholarship was, in its foundational ideology, open to any Muslim with the intelligence and dedication to master the textual tradition. The great hadith scholars of the eighth and ninth centuries — men like Malik ibn Anas, al-Shafii, Ahmad ibn Hanbal — were not the sons of scholars by birth right; they had achieved their authority through learning, through the recognition of other scholars, through the transmission chains that linked them to the companions of the Prophet. This openness to talent regardless of birth was one of the features that made the ulama class genuinely accessible to converts and their descendants in a way that the hereditary priesthoods of most ancient religions were not.

The ulama's relationship to state power was, from the beginning, more complex and more constrained than the magi's had been. They had no institutional infrastructure independent of state patronage — no endowed temples, no hereditary estates, no fire-based ritual monopoly. Their authority rested entirely on recognition: recognition by other scholars, transmitted through the chains of teachers and students that constituted the Islamic educational network, and recognition by the communities of believers who chose to consult them for legal rulings and spiritual guidance. This recognition-based authority was real and powerful, but it was also, in a specific sense, fragile: a scholar who lost the respect of his peers or his community lost his authority, because there was no institutional structure to sustain a discredited individual the way that a hereditary office sustained a personally inadequate holder.

The relationship between the ulama and the Abbasid caliphs was consequently one of structured tension rather than either simple subordination or genuine independence. The caliphs needed ulama legitimation — the support of recognized scholars for their governance decisions, their legal rulings, and their claims to Islamic authority — and they competed for it through patronage, through the appointment of scholars to qadi positions, and through the building of educational institutions that brought scholarly activity under caliphal influence. The ulama needed caliphal patronage — the resources that sustained their study, the positions through which they could exercise their expertise, the protection that made their public role possible — and they competed for it through demonstrating the usefulness of their knowledge and the quality of their rulings. The relationship was one of mutual dependence in which neither side fully controlled the other, and in which the terms of dependence were constantly being renegotiated through a combination of principled disagreement and practical accommodation.

The Mihna — the inquisition conducted by the Caliph al-Mamun and his successors between 833 and 848 CE, in which scholars were required to affirm the Mutazilite doctrine that the Quran was created rather than eternal, under pain of imprisonment for those who refused — represents the most direct attempt by an Abbasid caliph to subordinate the ulama class to caliphal authority, and its eventual failure is one of the most important events in the history of the relationship between Islamic scholarship and political power. Al-Mamun, deeply invested in the

rationalist Mutazilite theology and perhaps genuinely convinced that the doctrine of the Quran's eternity was theologically incorrect and politically dangerous (because it implied a source of authority independent of human interpretation and therefore of caliphal control), attempted to impose doctrinal uniformity through state power. The scholar Ahmad ibn Hanbal, imprisoned and flogged for refusing to affirm the Mutazilite position, became the symbol of scholarly resistance to caliphal theological overreach, and his eventual release under al-Mamun's successor represented the caliphate's implicit acknowledgment that the ulama's authority in matters of Islamic doctrine was not subject to simple state imposition. The failure of the Mihna established a precedent that would shape Sunni Islamic political theology for centuries: the caliph governed the community but did not define its doctrine; that was the ulama's prerogative.

Resistance That Failed and Resistance That Transformed

The Abbasid Revolution had been, in part, a movement of the religiously and materially aggrieved, and the Abbasid caliphate it produced inherited the expectations of the groups whose grievances had powered the revolution. Not all of those expectations were met, and the disappointment generated its own forms of resistance — some violent, some intellectual, some organizational — that reveal the limits of what even a revolutionary reconstitution of the caliphate could accomplish for the population whose energy it had harnessed.

Abu Muslim himself was the revolution's most conspicuous victim. The man who had organized the Khorasani uprising, raised and led the army that destroyed the Umayyad caliphate, and handed the Abbasid dynasty its empire was executed in 755 CE by the Caliph al-Mansur — stabbed to death in an audience chamber after al-Mansur had decided that his popularity in Khorasan, his independent military base, and his evident conviction that his role in the revolution entitled him to political influence made him too dangerous to leave alive. Abu Muslim's execution followed the same logic as the Barmakid fall half a century later: the military power that the revolution had required was incompatible, once the revolution was won, with the caliphal authority the revolution had been fought to establish. Al-Mansur reportedly told Abu Muslim, before giving the signal to the hidden guards: 'You have done what you have done, and the caliphate belongs to us.' The remark captures the relationship between military instrument and political beneficiary with unusual precision.

The execution of Abu Muslim generated a substantial Khorasani resistance movement — the Rawandiyya, followers who believed Abu Muslim had been a divine figure and whose uprising al-Mansur suppressed with considerable violence. More significant in the long run were the Khurramite movements — popular religious movements in the Iranian highlands that synthesized Mazdakite egalitarianism, Zoroastrian themes, and resistance to the Arab-Islamic order under a series of charismatic leaders across the late eighth and early ninth centuries. The most significant was the movement led by Babak Khurramdin in Azerbaijan, which maintained an armed resistance to Abbasid authority from approximately 816 to 837 CE — more than two decades of persistent insurgency in the mountain terrain of northwestern Iran that the Abbasid armies repeatedly failed to suppress. Babak drew on the Iranian peasantry's accumulated resentment of Arab conquest and its sequelae, articulated that resentment in religious terms that drew on pre-Islamic Iranian traditions, and led an insurgency that demonstrated both the depth of that resentment and the limits of the Abbasid state's military capacity in difficult terrain.

Babak's eventual defeat came not through the improvement of Abbasid military capacity but through the hiring of Turkish slave-soldiers — the ghulam/mamluk institution — whose military effectiveness in the mountain campaigns that had defeated Arab armies was significantly greater. The Caliph al-Mutasim, who came to power in 833, relied on Turkish military units to an

extent that his predecessors had avoided, calculating that soldiers whose ethnic identity was entirely separate from both the Arab and Persian populations of the empire would be more reliably loyal to the caliph personally than troops with local social ties. The calculation was correct in the short term: the Turks defeated Babak in 837 and executed him with theatrical brutality in 838. It was incorrect as a political strategy, because the Turkish military units that proved so effective against Babak proved equally effective, within a generation, at controlling the caliphs who had recruited them. By the mid-ninth century, Turkish military commanders were making and unmaking Abbasid caliphs with the same ease that Praetorian Guard commanders had made and unmade Roman emperors, and the caliphate's theological authority was being maintained by men who could not read the Arabic in which that authority was expressed. The military substrate had asserted its primacy, as it always does eventually, over the belief infrastructure built on top of it.

Continues in Part Four: The Persian-Islamic Synthesis — Language, Literature, Dynasty, and the Completion of Conversion, 800–1010 CE

THE CONQUERED CONQUERORS

Elite Power, the Conversion Economy, and the Transformation of Iranian Civilization, 224–1010 CE

PART FOUR

The Synthesis: New Persian, the Samanids, Ferdowsi, and the World the Conversion Made, 800–1010 CE and Beyond

Section II (Continued): The Shu'ubiyya — Appropriation Argued Back

When the Conquered Claimed to Be Superior

Sometime in the late eighth century, a body of Arabic literary and scholarly writing began to appear in the courts and study circles of the Abbasid caliphate that argued a proposition the Arab ruling culture found both irritating and difficult to answer: that the Persians were superior to the Arabs. Not in piety — that would have been simple heterodoxy. Not in Islam — that would have been incoherent. But in civilization, in culture, in the accumulated intellectual and artistic achievements that constituted the heritage of greatness, the Persians had produced more, and finer, and older than the Arabs had. The Shu'ubiyya — the movement takes its name from a Quranic verse affirming that God made humanity into peoples and tribes so that they might know one another — was the literary and intellectual expression of the Persian cultural elite's challenge to Arab ethnic supremacy, conducted entirely within the Islamic framework, using the Arabic language, drawing on the Islamic scholarly tradition's own methods of argument.

The Shu'ubiyya was not a unified movement with a single doctrine or a formal organization. It was a tendency — a disposition among Persian-educated writers and scholars to foreground Persian cultural achievements, to challenge the Arab cultural self-confidence that the Umayyad period had institutionalized, and to argue that the Islamic civilization of the Abbasid period was, in its highest expressions, substantially a Persian achievement that had been dressed in Arabic clothes. The great Shu'ubi writers — men like Ibn al-Muqaffa, who translated Persian wisdom literature into Arabic and in the process gave classical Arabic prose some of its finest early examples; or Bashshar ibn Burd, the blind poet of Iranian extraction who wrote Arabic verse of acknowledged brilliance while celebrating Persian culture and satirizing Arab pretensions; or al-Jahiz, who represents the opposition, an Arab writer of African descent who defended Arab cultural primacy against Shu'ubi claims with wit and learning — were debating, in the polished medium of classical Arabic, a question about which civilization's inheritance was more valuable. The debate itself was only possible because the Abbasid synthesis had created a space in which both sides were Muslim, both sides were conducting the argument in Arabic, and both sides were appealing to the standards of the same literary and scholarly tradition. The Persians were not arguing from outside Islam. They were arguing from inside it, claiming that their contributions to Islamic civilization were more significant than the Arabs were prepared to acknowledge.

Ibn al-Muqaffa deserves specific attention as the Shu'ubiyya's most analytically interesting figure. A Persian convert to Islam — his pre-conversion name was Ruzbih, son of a Sassanid tax official — Ibn al-Muqaffa became one of the greatest stylists in the history of classical Arabic prose, translating the Pahlavi collection of wisdom fables known as Kalila wa Dimna (itself a translation from Sanskrit via Middle Persian) into Arabic so elegantly that the work became a foundational text of Arabic literary culture. He also translated Sassanid royal chronicles and administrative manuals into Arabic, preserving Persian political thought in a form accessible to the caliphate's Arabic-educated ruling class. His own political writings — particularly the Risala fi al-Sahaba, a memorandum addressed to the Caliph al-Mansur on the proper governance of the caliphate — drew explicitly on Persian political theory and the Sassanid tradition of royal administration, arguing for a rationalized, bureaucratic state governed by trained administrators rather than by the tribal patronage networks that Arab political culture favored. He was executed around 757 CE, reportedly at the order of a governor who found his influence and his Persian

cultural pride equally offensive. His death, like the Barmakid fall and Abu Muslim's execution, followed the recurring pattern: Persian administrative and cultural talent was welcomed up to the point at which it began to feel like a rival power center, then eliminated.

The Shu'ubiyya's significance for this study lies not in its immediate political consequences — it did not overthrow anything or redistribute any property — but in what it reveals about the nature of the appropriation that the Abbasid period had produced. The Persian cultural elite was not passively absorbing Arab-Islamic culture. It was actively contesting the terms of the synthesis, claiming that the synthesis was more Persian than Arab in its essentials, and using the tools of the dominant culture — Arabic language, Islamic scholarship, the caliphal court's literary patronage — to make that claim. This is the intellectual parallel to the Abbasid Revolution's political appropriation: having converted to Islam and entered the Islamic framework, the Persian elite was working to reshape that framework from within, to claim the synthesis as theirs, to argue that what had conquered Persia had in the process become Persian. The argument was not entirely wrong.

New Persian: A Language Returns in Transformed Form

The emergence of New Persian as a literary language in the ninth century is one of the most remarkable linguistic events in the history of world civilization, and it is possible to miss its full significance if it is read simply as the revival of Persian literary culture after the interruption of the Arab conquest. New Persian was not a revival of Middle Persian (Pahlavi) — it was a new language, transformed by three centuries of Arabic contact so thoroughly that it had absorbed thousands of Arabic loanwords, adopted the Arabic script, restructured some of its grammatical categories under Arabic influence, and embedded Islamic theological and philosophical vocabulary so deeply that extracting it would leave the language impoverished beyond recognition. It was Persian in its grammatical core, its literary sensibility, its cultural memory, and its speakers' sense of identity. It was Islamic in its script, much of its vocabulary, all of its formal literary conventions, and the religious world in which it was embedded. It was the Abbasid synthesis made linguistic.

The earliest monuments of New Persian literary culture emerged in Khorasan and the Transoxiana region — the same northeastern Iranian territory that had been the base of the Abbasid Revolution — under the patronage of the Tahirid and Saffarid dynasties that governed the eastern provinces with increasing autonomy through the ninth century, and especially under the Samanids whose rise will be examined below. The poet Rudaki, active at the Samanid court in Bukhara in the early tenth century and credited by later Persian literary tradition as the father of Persian poetry, is the first major New Persian literary figure whose work survives in substantial fragments. His poetry draws on both the Arabic qasida tradition — the elaborate formal praise poem that was the dominant genre of Arabic court poetry — and the Persian oral tradition of lyric verse that had survived the conquest in non-literary form, synthesizing them into something that was recognizably continuous with both while identical to neither. The literary form is Islamic court poetry. The sensibility — the celebration of wine, love, the pleasures of a cultivated court life, the melancholy awareness of transience — is Persian in ways that feel continuous across the pre-Islamic divide despite everything that had changed.

The development of New Persian as an administrative language proceeded in parallel with its literary development, and the two tracks reinforced each other. The Samanid court in Bukhara conducted some of its business in New Persian from at least the mid-ninth century, gradually expanding its use from internal correspondence to formal documents and eventually to the full range of administrative functions that Arabic had monopolized under the central Abbasid

caliphate. The administrative use of Persian did not challenge the religious primacy of Arabic — Quran, hadith, Islamic law, and formal theological discourse remained in Arabic throughout, and no serious Samanid official proposed otherwise. But it established Persian as the language of secular governance in the eastern Islamic world, creating a division between religious Arabic and administrative Persian that would characterize the governmental culture of the Persian-Islamic world for centuries. Rulers would pray in Arabic, govern in Persian, and understand both as natural, non-contradictory expressions of a single civilizational identity.

Section VI: The Samanids — The First Persian-Islamic State

Elite Continuity Through Civilizational Transformation

The Samanid dynasty, which governed Khorasan and Transoxiana from 819 to 999 CE, represents the most complete expression of the Persian-Islamic synthesis that the Abbasid revolution had made possible and that the subsequent century of conversion, cultural negotiation, and political fragmentation had been gradually producing. The Samanids were Iranian Muslims — their family claimed descent from the Sassanid general Bahram Chobin, a lineage that connected them to the pre-Islamic Persian aristocracy while their Islamic faith and their service to the Abbasid caliphate provided their contemporary legitimacy. They governed an empire centered in Bukhara and Samarkand that was, in administrative culture, literary patronage, and elite social practice, overwhelmingly Persian, while being in religious life, legal framework, and theological identity thoroughly Islamic. They were, in the most precise sense, what the Islamization of Persia had been producing across three centuries of conversion economy: a Muslim elite that was culturally Persian without contradiction.

The Samanid state's administrative structure reveals the dehqan class's transformation across the conversion period with unusual clarity. The great families that administered Samanid territory — collecting taxes, managing irrigation infrastructure, adjudicating local disputes, providing military contingents — were the descendants of the same dehqan families that had performed these functions under the Sassanids and accommodated themselves to Arab authority in the immediate post-conquest period. Their names had changed — Arabic given names were now standard, Persian family names often retained — their religion had changed, their language of formal record-keeping had changed, and the theological framework through which they understood their social role had changed. Their structural position in the social order had not changed. They still held the land. They still managed the villages. They still provided the administrative expertise without which no government of the Iranian plateau could function. The Islamization of Persia had transformed the content of elite identity while preserving the structural form of elite power with remarkable continuity.

This continuity is the single most important thing that the conversion economy's three-century operation had accomplished. The Arab conquest had decapitated the Sassanid state and eliminated its political structure. It had not eliminated the social classes whose cooperation the Sassanid state had required and whose continued existence was necessary for any successor state that wished to govern the Iranian plateau effectively. By the Samanid period, those classes had fully reconstituted their social position within the new order — not by resisting Islam but by joining it, shaping it, and eventually governing through it. The new ruling class was Muslim. It was also, in every functionally significant sense, the old ruling class. The belief system had changed. The structure of power had endured.

The Samanid court at Bukhara was, in the tenth century, one of the great centers of Islamic civilization — a gathering point for scholars, poets, philosophers, and scientists whose work was conducted in both Arabic and Persian and whose collective output constitutes some of the most significant intellectual production of the medieval world. The philosopher and physician Ibn Sina — known to the Latin West as Avicenna — was born in 980 CE in the Samanid province of Bukhara and received his early education under Samanid patronage. His Canon of Medicine, written in Arabic, synthesized Greek medical tradition with Islamic pharmaceutical knowledge and Persian clinical observation in a text that would remain the foundational medical authority in both the Islamic world and Europe for six centuries. His philosophical works — also in Arabic — represent the most sophisticated engagement of Islamic thought with Aristotelian philosophy that the medieval world produced, working through problems in metaphysics, epistemology, and the soul that neither tradition had resolved on its own. Ibn Sina is, in his person and his work, the embodiment of the Abbasid synthesis: a Persian, writing in Arabic, within the Islamic framework, extending the Greek philosophical tradition, under the patronage of a Persian-Islamic dynasty. Every element of the synthesis is present simultaneously, inseparable from the others.

The Samanid Literary Court: Patronage as Cultural Architecture

The Samanid court's literary patronage was not simply the personal taste of cultivated rulers; it was a deliberate cultural policy through which the dynasty constructed its identity and its claim to civilizational authority. Patronizing poets who wrote in New Persian was simultaneously an artistic choice and a political statement: an assertion that Persian cultural production was valued, that Persian linguistic identity was legitimate within the Islamic framework, and that the Samanid court was the heir not just to the Abbasid caliphate's political authority in the east but to the Sassanid tradition's cultural prestige. The poets who competed for Samanid patronage understood the political dimensions of their position as clearly as the dynasty did. Their poems in praise of Samanid rulers drew on both the Arabic panegyric tradition and the Persian tradition of royal glorification, creating texts that worked in both registers simultaneously and that required a biculturally educated audience to appreciate fully.

The institutional form of this patronage — the court literary circle, the gathering of scholars and poets around a royal patron who rewarded the best with money and position — was itself a Sassanid inheritance that the Islamic world had adopted without significant modification. The Sassanid courts had been centers of literary and scholarly cultivation, and the court poetry tradition, the wisdom literature genre, and the philosophical discussion format that characterized Samanid cultural life all had direct antecedents in the Sassanid cultural world. When Samanid courtiers gathered to hear a poet recite, they were participating in a social form that would have been immediately recognizable to their Sassanid predecessors, despite the fact that the language, the religion, and the specific content of the poetry had all changed. This continuity of form alongside transformation of content is the Abbasid synthesis in its cultural expression: not the replacement of Iranian civilization but its reconstitution within the Islamic framework, preserving enough of its characteristic practices and aesthetic sensibilities that it remained recognizably Iranian while becoming genuinely Islamic.

The Samanid dynasty's collapse in 999 CE — overrun by the Turkic Ghaznavid dynasty from the east and the Qarakhanid Turks from the north — did not interrupt the cultural tradition the Samanids had patronized. The Ghaznavid Sultan Mahmud, who destroyed the Samanid state and carved up its territory, continued Samanid cultural policy with remarkable consistency, patronizing Persian poets and scholars at his court in Ghazna and competing for the prestige that association with the best Persian literary talent could provide. It was under Mahmud's

patronage — and under considerable pressure from Mahmud's court regarding the poem's length, its content, and its author's religious orthodoxy — that Ferdowsi completed the Shahnameh. The fact that the great monument of Persian cultural continuity was composed under the patronage of a Turkish dynasty that had just destroyed the last Persian-ruled state is itself one of the study's most illuminating ironies: by the early eleventh century, Persian literary culture had become so thoroughly the prestige culture of the Islamic east that Turkic rulers competed to claim association with it regardless of their own ethnic background.

Section II (Continued): The Shahnameh — The Synthesis Crystallized

What the Book of Kings Actually Is

Ferdowsi's Shahnameh — the Book of Kings, completed around 1010 CE after approximately thirty years of composition — is the longest poem by a single author in world literature, running to approximately 60,000 couplets in its complete form, and it is also the most important single cultural artifact produced by the Islamization of Persia. Not because it is the period's finest literary achievement, though many scholars would make that argument. But because it encapsulates, in a single monumental text, every tension and every resolution that three and a half centuries of conversion, appropriation, and synthesis had produced. Reading the Shahnameh as a historical document — attending to what it is, what it does, what it assumes, and what it reveals about the world in which it was produced — teaches more about the Islamization of Persia than most explicit historical accounts.

The poem narrates the history of the Iranian kings from the mythological creation of the world through the Arab conquest and the fall of the last Sassanid emperor, Yazdegerd III. Its subject matter is overwhelmingly pre-Islamic — the great heroes of Iranian legend, the Zoroastrian-tinged cosmic struggles of the mythological age, the historical kings of the Achaemenid and Parthian and Sassanid dynasties — and yet its author was a Muslim, writing within the Islamic literary tradition, for an audience of Muslim readers and listeners at an Islamic court. The poem never pretends that its pre-Islamic world is the equal of the Islamic world that followed it; the Arab conquest appears at the end as a catastrophe that nevertheless represents, in some sense, the will of God. Ferdowsi does not reconcile this tension so much as hold it in suspension — the pre-Islamic Persian world is presented as genuinely glorious, its heroes genuinely heroic, its civilization genuinely great, and its destruction genuinely tragic, all within a framework that does not deny the Islamic supersession.

The specific theological gymnastics required to make this simultaneously celebratory and submissive — to write sixty thousand couplets in praise of a pre-Islamic civilization while remaining a credibly orthodox Muslim — are visible throughout the poem and are themselves evidence of the cultural work the Shahnameh was performing. Ferdowsi attributes the virtues of his pre-Islamic heroes — justice, courage, wisdom, the defense of the weak against the strong — to God's blessing (farreh, the Persian royal divine glory, discreetly assimilated to divine grace in general) rather than to specifically Zoroastrian theological categories, allowing the heroes to be admirable without requiring the reader to endorse Zoroastrian theology. The great villains of the poem — Zahhak the tyrant with serpents growing from his shoulders, the symbol of unjust rule — are presented in terms that resonate equally well within Islamic categories of right governance and Zoroastrian categories of truth versus the lie. The poem's moral universe is

Persian in its specific content and universally readable across the Islamic-Persian divide because Ferdowsi had constructed it to be.

The Shahnameh's most analytically significant feature is what it assumes about its audience. The poem assumes that its readers are Muslims — that needs no statement or defense. It also assumes that they know who Rostam is, why the battle of Qadisiyyah matters, what the Sassanid court looked like, what the sacred fires meant, why Yazdegerd's death is a tragedy as well as a divine judgment. It assumes, in other words, that its Muslim audience has absorbed the pre-Islamic Persian cultural heritage as part of its own inheritance, that Persian Muslims claim the pre-Islamic Persian past as their own history rather than as the alien history of a superseded civilization. This assumption is the measure of how complete the Islamization had become: complete enough that pre-Islamic Persia was no longer threatening, no longer a competing source of authority that needed to be rejected or suppressed, but simply the past — glorious, acknowledged, celebrated, and absorbed. A belief system that required active suppression of pre-Islamic memory in the tenth century would not have permitted the Shahnameh. The fact that the poem could be written, patronized by Muslim rulers, and enthusiastically received by Muslim audiences tells us that by 1010 CE the conversion had achieved something that mere military conquest never could: the internalization of Islamic identity deeply enough that pre-Islamic Persian culture could be celebrated without threatening it.

What the Shahnameh Preserved and What It Transformed

The question of what the Islamization of Persia preserved from the pre-Islamic world and what it destroyed is one that the Shahnameh illuminates better than any other source, precisely because it was produced at the moment of synthesis's completion and because its author was consciously engaged in the project of preservation. Ferdowsi states explicitly in his preface that he sought out whatever remained of the ancient Iranian traditions — old books, oral accounts from the dehqan families who had maintained them — and composed them into a form that would endure. He was writing against erasure, aware that the Pahlavi textual tradition was disappearing, aware that the oral transmission of Persian legendary history was fragile, and determined to fix it in the more durable medium of New Persian literary verse.

What the Shahnameh preserved was the narrative content of Iranian legendary and historical tradition — the heroes, the stories, the genealogies of the kings, the great battles and catastrophes that constituted the Iranian cultural memory of its own past. This preservation was genuine and important: without the Shahnameh, our knowledge of the Avestan and Pahlavi narrative traditions would be enormously impoverished. But the preservation was also a transformation. The Shahnameh's Rostam is not the Rostam of the Avestan texts; he has been filtered through three centuries of Islamic culture, of Arabic literary conventions, of the theological framework within which Ferdowsi thought and wrote. The Shahnameh is a Persian book, and it is an Islamic book, and it is not possible to cleanly separate what is Persian from what is Islamic in it because its author was a person in whom those identities were not separable.

What the Islamization did not preserve from pre-Islamic Iranian civilization is traceable through the absences in the Shahnameh and in the broader cultural record. The Zoroastrian priestly tradition — the magi, the fire temple hierarchy, the elaborate ritual system through which Zoroastrian theology was actually practiced — is present in the Shahnameh as historical background but not as living institution. Ferdowsi can describe a Zoroastrian ceremony or a fire temple because he has read about them; he cannot describe them from the inside, from

participation, because by his time the tradition was no longer alive in his community. The Avestan language itself — the sacred tongue in which Zoroastrian liturgy was performed — had become so specialized that its knowledge was confined to a small and shrinking community of priests; it was not a language that educated Persian Muslims could read, unlike the Latin that educated European Christians could access even as a foreign learned tongue. The living Zoroastrian tradition, as distinct from the cultural memory of it, was gone from the Iranian heartland. The Shahnameh preserves its memory; it cannot restore its substance.

The physical infrastructure of the pre-Islamic world had largely followed the same trajectory. The great fire temples — Adur Gushnasp in Azerbaijan, Adur Burzen-Mihr in Khorasan, Adur Farnbag in Fars, the three sacred fires of the Sassanid state religion — were extinguished, converted to mosques, or abandoned over the long Umayyad and early Abbasid period. The conversion of fire temples to mosques was sometimes a deliberate act of symbolic overwriting and sometimes a practical response to a community that had converted and needed a new place of worship in the existing building stock; the sources rarely specify which motive predominated in specific cases, and in many cases both were probably present simultaneously. The archaeological record of the conversion is visible across the Iranian plateau: sites that yield Sassanid-era fire temple remains frequently also yield early Islamic mosque construction, the architectural transition visible in the physical stratigraphy. The belief system changed, and the buildings in which it was practiced changed with it, and there was no reconstruction.

Section VIII: Long-Term Consequences — What the Islamization of Persia Made

The Decorative Legitimation Lifecycle: Full Trajectory

The Islamic belief-power system that arrived in Persia with the Arab armies in the 630s and had, by 1010 CE, thoroughly transformed Iranian civilization followed the trajectory that the analytical framework for these studies predicts for any belief system deployed in the service of power — but at a pace and in a form specific to the Islamic case. The early Arab-Islamic conquest ideology was as close to Phase 1 — sincere deployment — as any historical case offers: the warriors who fought at al-Qadisiyyah and Nihavand were, by every available indication, genuinely motivated by religious conviction in ways that produced military effectiveness demonstrably beyond what their numbers and resources alone could explain. The belief was real, and it was consequential.

The Umayyad period represented Phase 2 — instrumental deployment — in its most visible form. The universal brotherhood of Islam was maintained as official theology while Arab ethnic privilege was maintained as administrative reality. The Umayyad caliphs were not, in the main, insincere Muslims; they performed the pilgrimage, observed Islamic practice, and promoted Islamic expansion. But they also consistently organized the caliphate's fiscal and political machinery in ways that served Arab ethnic interests over Islamic universalist ones, and this instrumental use of the theological framework was visible enough to generate the specific, articulable grievances that powered the Abbasid Revolution. Phase 2 generates the opposition that produces Phase 3 by making the gap between the theology and the practice visible to those who bear the cost of the gap.

The late Abbasid period — from roughly the mid-ninth century, when Turkish military commanders began controlling the succession of caliphs, through the Buyid Persian dynasty's

seizure of effective political power in 945, to the Mongol destruction of Baghdad in 1258 — represents Phase 3: decorative legitimation. The Abbasid caliphs retained their formal religious authority — the right to grant investiture to Muslim rulers across the Islamic world, the symbolic link to the Prophet's family that gave any ruler's authority its Islamic legitimacy — long after they had lost any capacity to exercise political or military power independently. The Buyid dynasty, which controlled Baghdad from 945 to 1055, was Shia in its personal religious orientation but maintained a Sunni Abbasid caliph on his throne because the caliphal legitimation was too valuable a political resource to discard, even for rulers who did not share the Sunni theological tradition that the Abbasid caliphate represented. The caliph prayed at Friday prayers; the Buyid amir commanded the army. The belief system provided the legitimating narrative; the military force provided the actual governance. This is Phase 3 in its structural definition.

The complete cycle — from sincere deployment through instrumental use to decorative legitimation — took approximately three hundred years in the Islamic case, from the original conquest in the 630s to the Turkish takeover in the 840s-860s. This timeline is comparable to the medieval Catholic Church's trajectory in the Reformation study, which ran from roughly the Gregorian Reform of the eleventh century (Phase 1 reinvigoration) through the fourteenth-century Avignon papacy (Phase 2 instrumentalization) to the pre-Reformation period (Phase 3 transparency). The mechanisms that drive the cycle appear to be independent of the specific content of the belief system: the logic of institutional success, aristocratic colonization of the interpretive class, and the progressive gap between stated purpose and visible operation seems to generate Phase 3 within a broadly similar timeframe across very different historical contexts.

The Zoroastrian Community: Elimination Without Massacre

The fate of Zoroastrianism in Persia is one of the most instructive cases in the broader history of how belief systems disappear, because it demonstrates a mechanism of elimination that does not appear in the standard repertoire of religious persecution: not massacre, not forced conversion at sword point, not the Five Conditions of active suppression that produced the Cathar elimination in thirteenth-century France. The Zoroastrian community was not destroyed by violence. It was marginalized by three centuries of a conversion economy that made non-conversion progressively less viable, until the community contracted below the threshold of self-sustainability in the Iranian heartland.

The mechanism's specific steps are traceable in outline even through the filter of Islamic-era sources. The dhimma framework provided formal protection but imposed fiscal burden and status demotion. The Arabicization of administration created professional incentives for conversion that were experienced as practical necessity rather than religious pressure. The growth of the Muslim majority community progressively narrowed the social world available to non-converters — the marriage market, the commercial networks, the neighborhood social structures that make minority existence either bearable or isolating. The Zoroastrian priestly class shrank as its economic base — temple endowments, community contributions — shrank with the converting community, which reduced the institutional capacity for religious education and community maintenance, which reduced the community's ability to reproduce itself culturally across generations, which accelerated conversion. The feedback loop was self-reinforcing and ultimately self-consuming.

The Parsi diaspora in India — the communities of Iranian Zoroastrians who migrated to Gujarat between roughly the eighth and tenth centuries and whose descendants survive today — represents the trajectory of communities that chose exit over accommodation. They preserved

Zoroastrian practice in geographic isolation from the conversion economy's pressures, paying the cost of displacement and the loss of their Iranian homeland in exchange for the freedom to maintain their religious identity without the escalating material penalties that staying would have imposed. The Parsi community in India maintained extraordinary cultural continuity across a millennium and a half of diaspora existence — their religious texts, their ritual practices, their Avestan liturgy, their community structure — in ways that the Iranian Zoroastrian community that remained could not. The communities that left preserved more of what they left behind than the communities that stayed.

The few Zoroastrian communities that survived in Iran — concentrated in the desert cities of Yazd and Kerman, geographically isolated enough from the main currents of Islamic administrative life to maintain communal coherence — did so precisely through this isolation. Their survival was not accommodation; it was quarantine. They maintained Zoroastrian identity by minimizing contact with the conversion economy's pressures, accepting a degree of social marginality that allowed them to preserve their tradition at the cost of any participation in the dominant society's institutions. The community that survives in Iran today — numbering perhaps 25,000 to 30,000 people, concentrated in Yazd and Tehran — is the remnant of what was once the state religion of one of the ancient world's greatest empires. The arithmetic of the conversion economy, applied consistently across three centuries, produced this outcome without a single massacre, without a formal policy of elimination, and without any single dramatic moment of decision. It produced it through the accumulated weight of a million individual calculations, each individually rational, collectively catastrophic for the tradition those individuals were leaving.

The Safavid Inversion: Appropriation Completing Its Circle

The long-term trajectory of the Islamization of Persia did not conclude with the Samanid synthesis or the Shahnameh. It produced, five centuries later, one of the most consequential second-order appropriations in Islamic history: the Safavid dynasty's adoption of Twelver Shia Islam as the state religion of Iran in 1501, creating the distinctive Persian-Shia identity that defines Iranian civilization to the present day.

The Safavid dynasty that conquered Iran under Shah Ismail I in 1501 was, by origin, a Sufi religious order of Azerbaijani Turkish-speaking background whose ideological evolution had carried it, through the late fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, from Sunni orthodoxy through a series of increasingly heterodox positions into something close to Twelver Shia Islam. Shah Ismail himself claimed descent from the Shia imams through his family's mystical lineage — a genealogical claim whose historical validity scholars have questioned but whose political function was unmistakable. By declaring Twelver Shia Islam the state religion of the territory he was conquering, Ismail was performing, in 1501, essentially the same operation that the Abbasid Revolution had performed in 750: appropriating an existing religious tradition — in this case, a minority Islamic tradition with deep roots in Iraqi and Iranian popular religiosity — to create a legitimating framework for a new political order, and creating a state whose institutional identity was inseparable from a specific version of Islamic belief.

The Safavid choice of Twelver Shia Islam as the state religion was not politically innocent. The primary rivals of the emerging Safavid state were the Ottoman Empire to the west and the Uzbek confederation to the east, both of which were Sunni. The theological distinction between Sunni and Shia Islam became, under Safavid institutionalization, the marker of Iranian political identity against Ottoman and Uzbek rival powers — a boundary that was simultaneously religious and national, theological and strategic. The Safavids imported Shia scholars from the Arab Shia communities of Iraq and Lebanon to staff the new state religion's institutional

apparatus, because Iranian religious learning had been predominantly Sunni under the Abbasid and subsequent dynasties, and the infrastructure of Shia jurisprudence and theology needed to be constructed almost from scratch. The imported scholars brought their legal traditions; the Safavid state provided the resources and political backing; and within a generation, the Iranian population had been substantially converted — by a combination of official pressure, institutional incentive, and the Safavid state's willingness to use force against those who refused — from Sunni to Shia Islam.

The Safavid transformation is the Islamization of Persia's own conversion economy applied to an already-Muslim population: the same mechanisms of administrative pressure, institutional incentive, and escalating cost of non-conformity that had converted Zoroastrian Persia to Islam now converted Sunni Persia to Shiism. The outcome established the distinctive Persian-Shia identity that endures. Modern Iran's Islamic Republic, governed by Shia clerics on the authority of the Wilayat-e Faqih doctrine developed by Ayatollah Khomeini, represents the full completion of a trajectory that began with the Sassanid state's Zoroastrian theology: belief providing legitimation for political power, interpretive specialists claiming authority over governance, and the military substrate that ultimately guarantees any such arrangement operating behind the institutional facade. The specific content has changed three times across fourteen centuries — from Zoroastrian to Sunni Islamic to Shia Islamic. The structural logic has not changed at all.

Comparative Analysis and Conclusions

The Three Cases: What Each One Reveals

This study has been conducted alongside two companion cases — the Sudan Islamization and the Protestant Reformation — and the three together constitute a comparative test of the analytical framework that no single case could provide. Each case deploys the same mechanism: elites using belief systems to organize power, extract resources, and manage populations. Each case tests different aspects of how the mechanism operates under different structural conditions. Identifying what is universal across the three cases and what is specific to each is the final analytical task.

The Sudan case, as the modern and fully documented anchor of the series, established the mechanism's baseline: a faction appropriates an existing belief system, uses it to seize state power through institutional capture, redirects wealth extraction through belief-aligned institutional forms, and creates stakeholder classes whose material interest in the new arrangement makes it durable. Al-Turabi built the ideology and the organizational apparatus; al-Bashir controlled the army; when they split, the military prevailed because it always does. The case is analytically valuable precisely because its compressed timeframe — the critical decade from 1989 to 1999 — makes the mechanism visible in something close to real-time, without the interpretive fog that accumulates around events separated from the analyst by centuries.

The Reformation case established that the mechanism operates at civilizational scale and over extended time, and demonstrated what happens when an appropriation contest is waged over a belief system so deeply embedded that neither side can win decisively. The Reformation's specific contribution was the demonstration of belief boundary cost: when two sufficiently powerful factions contest a belief system and neither achieves decisive military superiority, the cost of maintaining the boundary between them — borne by populations who had no meaningful choice in establishing it — can be catastrophic. The Thirty Years' War's three to eight million

deaths were the price of a boundary that the Peace of Augsburg's internal contradictions made inevitable and that the absence of a decisive military resolution on either side made impossible to close. The Reformation also demonstrated the conversion economy operating at the elite level — German princes and English gentry converting for specific, calculable material gains — while the population converted by social logic following elite decisions rather than by independent material calculation.

The Persian case adds dimensions that neither of the others could provide. It is the only one of the three in which the conversion economy operated as the primary transformation mechanism across the full population, from the elite level of the dehqan calculation to the village level of peasant families watching their neighbors convert and recalculating their own positions. It is the only one in which the conquered appropriated the conqueror's belief system rather than the reverse, producing the counterintuitive outcome in which the direction of cultural flow and the direction of military conquest ran opposite to each other. And it is the case that most clearly demonstrates the distinction between two fundamentally different mechanisms of belief system replacement: active suppression (meeting the Five Conditions, as the Cathars experienced) and passive displacement through the conversion economy (as the Zoroastrians experienced). Both mechanisms can eliminate a belief system from a population. They do so at different speeds, through different social processes, and with different residues — the Cathar community was destroyed so thoroughly that almost nothing survived; the Zoroastrian community survived, barely, in diaspora and desert isolation, because the conversion economy's slower mechanism left enough time for communities with sufficient isolation and cohesion to partially opt out of it.

The Conversion Economy: What Persia Reveals That the Other Cases Cannot

Richard Bulliet's onomastic methodology — tracking conversion rates through the pattern of name adoption in biographical dictionaries — provides for the Persian case what no comparable methodology can provide for the Sudan or Reformation cases: a quantitative picture of how the conversion economy operated across social levels and across time. The S-curve pattern that Bulliet identified — slow initial adoption, accelerating middle adoption, late completion — is not just a demographic description. It is a map of the social logic of conversion under a dhimma-type system, and it reveals several things about how belief change actually propagates through societies that the intellectual history of religious conversion tends to obscure.

First, the S-curve's timing correlates with social position more than with geographic proximity to the conquest or with the intensity of administrative pressure in any given period. Families with greater exposure to the Islamic administrative and commercial network converted earlier; families more insulated from that network converted later. This correlation is the conversion economy's signature: the rate of belief change tracks the rate of material exposure to the incentive structure, not the rate of spiritual encounter with the belief system's content. This does not mean that the spiritual content was irrelevant — for the individuals involved, the theological substance of their new faith was often the primary conscious experience of conversion, and the historical record has no way to access the interior of anyone's religious experience. What it means is that the aggregate pattern of conversion across a population is explained by material variables, not spiritual ones, which suggests that for the population as a whole, the material logic was doing most of the work even when individual experience was primarily spiritual.

Second, the S-curve reveals the role of social threshold effects in belief change. Conversion was not simply a function of individual calculation; it was a function of what one's neighbors and

family members and business partners had already done. Communities where conversion had crossed a certain threshold found that the remaining non-converters faced qualitatively different social pressures than had existed when the community was predominantly non-Muslim — the minority status activated pressures (marriage market narrowing, commercial network exclusion, social isolation) that were not present when the community was predominantly Zoroastrian. The S-curve's acceleration through the ninth century corresponds to the period when conversion crossed majority thresholds in most urban centers and many rural districts, activating these threshold effects at scale. The late adopters were not less rational than the early adopters; they were facing a different incentive structure, one in which the community infrastructure that had sustained non-Muslim identity was progressively dissolving around them.

Third, and most importantly for comparative analysis, the Persian case reveals that the conversion economy is more effective over the long run than active suppression for eliminating a belief system — not because it is gentler (the human cost of three centuries of progressive marginalization, cultural erasure, and communal dissolution is not obviously smaller than the human cost of a specific military suppression campaign) but because it does not generate the martyrological tradition that active suppression reliably creates. The Cathars who died at Montségur became the symbol of a tradition's destruction; the Zoroastrians who simply converted over three centuries, family by family, generation by generation, left no comparably vivid moment of resistance and death around which subsequent memory could organize. The conversion economy is, in a specific sense, harder to remember than a massacre. Its victims did not die in ways that histories record; they simply stopped being Zoroastrian, which is the quietest form of disappearance a civilization can experience.

Military Force as the Final Substrate — Three Cases, One Logic

Across all three cases, the military dimension resolves every crisis that ideology cannot contain, and it does so with a regularity that goes beyond coincidence into structural necessity. In Sudan, al-Bashir's military prevailed over al-Turabi's ideological network when the two came into direct conflict; the Islamic banking system, the intellectual infrastructure, the organizational apparatus of the NIF were all real sources of power, but they were not military power, and military power is what settled the question. In the Reformation, every attempt to resolve the confessional conflict through theological argument, legal settlement, or negotiated compromise eventually led back to armies, and the final settlement — the Peace of Westphalia — codified what the military balance on the ground had established across thirty years of catastrophic war. In the Persian case, the Abbasid Revolution succeeded because it had better military organization in the east than the Umayyads could deploy against it; the Barmakids fell because they had no military capacity to resist the caliph's guards; Abu Muslim was executed because he had too much military capacity to be safely managed. The Turkish military commanders who eventually controlled Abbasid succession did so simply by being the people with the most reliable access to organized violence in a political system where that access was the ultimate resource.

This consistency across three cases from three different centuries and three different cultural contexts is the analytical framework's strongest predictive success. The claim that military force is the substrate on which all belief-based governance ultimately rests is not a cynical dismissal of the reality of belief; it is a structural observation about what happens when belief-based arrangements are pushed to their limits by conflict. At the limit — when the stakes are high enough, when the parties are committed enough, when the theological argument has run its course — the question of who controls organized violence determines the outcome. The theological argument continues afterward, conducted by the victors, explaining why God favored their side. But the argument does not determine the outcome. The armies do.

What This Case Study Contributes

The Islamization of Persia makes a specific contribution to the series that the Reformation case cannot make and the Sudan case cannot make: it demonstrates the conversion economy as civilizational transformation. The Reformation case shows the conversion economy operating at the elite level, with populations following their rulers' choices rather than making independent calculations. The Sudan case shows institutional capture — tamkeen — operating faster than the conversion economy proper, because the compressed timeframe of a modern state's administrative reach made elite capture sufficient without waiting for the population-level conversion process to run its course. The Persian case shows the full three-century operation of a conversion economy that reached every level of society, from the dehqan family calculating whether its sons should study Arabic and Islamic law to the urban craftsman calculating whether his commercial position would be better as a Muslim, and produced a genuine civilizational transformation — not just a change of rulers or a change of state ideology but a change in what the population believed, how it organized its life, what language it wrote its poetry in, and what it called sacred.

The most important specific insight the Persian case produces is the demonstration that the conquered can be more consequential than the conqueror in determining what the new civilization looks like. The Arabs brought Islam to Persia. The Persians made Islam sophisticated. The theology, the philosophy, the jurisprudence, the literary tradition, the administrative culture that became 'Islamic civilization' in its classical form were substantially products of the Persian intellectual tradition working within the Islamic framework — Ibn Sina and al-Farabi in philosophy, al-Tabari in history, al-Ghazali in theology, Rumi and Hafiz in poetry, the entire adab tradition of cultivated prose. The Arabs provided the revelation and the political framework. The Persians provided the civilization. The conquered conquered the conqueror's culture even as they adopted his belief, and the result was neither purely Arab nor purely Persian but something that neither could have produced alone — the Persian-Islamic synthesis that became the dominant cultural form of the medieval Muslim world and that endures, in transformed but recognizable form, to the present day.

That outcome was not what anyone planned. The Arab commanders who rode into Ctesiphon in 637 CE did not intend to create a civilization in which their descendants' rulers would pray to God in Arabic and govern in Persian and commission poetry that celebrated the pre-Islamic world they had conquered. The Persian dehqan families who converted in the eighth century to preserve their estates and their administrative relevance did not intend to become the architects of a new synthesis that would reshape Islamic civilization from Baghdad to Bengal. The conversion economy that drove the transformation operated through millions of individual calculations whose aggregate consequence was a civilizational transformation that no individual calculator had anticipated or intended. This is how belief systems transform civilizations: not through the conscious design of any single actor, but through the accumulated weight of individual decisions made in response to specific material incentives, producing collective outcomes that dwarf any single intention. The framework that makes this visible across the Sudan, the Reformation, and the Islamization of Persia is not describing three different phenomena. It is describing one phenomenon, operating in three different historical settings, with three different surface appearances, and one underlying logic.

Bibliography

Primary Sources in Translation

Al-Biruni, Abu Rayhan. The Chronology of Ancient Nations (Athar al-Baqiya). Translated by C. Edward Sachau. London: William H. Allen, 1879.

Al-Biruni, Abu Rayhan. The Book of Instruction in the Elements of the Art of Astrology. Translated by R. Ramsay Wright. London: Luzac, 1934.

Al-Baladhuri, Ahmad ibn Yahya. Futuh al-Buldan (Origins of the Islamic State). Translated by Philip Hitti. New York: Columbia University Press, 1916.

Al-Tabari, Muhammad ibn Jarir. The History of al-Tabari. Translated by multiple scholars. 40 vols. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1985–2007. Particularly relevant volumes: Vol. 14 (Conquest of Iran), Vol. 28 (Abbasid Revolution), Vol. 31 (Court of al-Mansur).

Al-Masudi, Ali ibn al-Husayn. The Meadows of Gold (Muruj al-Dhahab). Translated by Paul Lunde and Caroline Stone. London: Kegan Paul International, 1989.

Denkard (Acts of Religion). Partial translations in Shaked, Shaul. The Wisdom of the Sasanian Sages. Boulder: Westview Press, 1979.

Ferdowsi, Abolqasem. Shahnameh: The Persian Book of Kings. Translated by Dick Davis. New York: Viking Penguin, 2006.

Ibn al-Muqaffa, Abdallah. Kalila wa Dimna. Translated by Wheeler Thackston as Kalilah and Dimnah: Fables of Virtue and Vice. Indianapolis: Hackett, 2019.

Ibn al-Nadim, Muhammad. The Fihrist: A Tenth-Century Survey of Muslim Culture. Translated by Bayard Dodge. 2 vols. New York: Columbia University Press, 1970.

Ibn Sina (Avicenna). The Book of Healing (Kitab al-Shifa), metaphysics section. Translated by Michael Marmura as The Metaphysics of the Healing. Provo, UT: Brigham Young University Press, 2005.

The Bundahishn: Iranian or Greater Bundahishn. Translated by Behramgore Anklesaria. Bombay: Rahnumae Mazdayasnan Sabha, 1956.

Zosimos of Panopolis / Procopius. Various accounts of the Byzantine-Sassanid wars. In Greatrex, Geoffrey, and Samuel Lieu, eds. The Roman Eastern Frontier and the Persian Wars, Part II: AD 363–630. London: Routledge, 2002.

The Sassanid Empire and Zoroastrianism

Boyce, Mary. A History of Zoroastrianism. 3 vols. Leiden: Brill, 1975–1991.

Boyce, Mary. Zoroastrians: Their Religious Beliefs and Practices. London: Routledge, 1979.

Daryaee, Touraj. Sasanian Persia: The Rise and Fall of an Empire. London: I.B. Tauris, 2009.

de Jong, Albert. Traditions of the Magi: Zoroastrianism in Greek and Latin Literature. Leiden: Brill, 1997.

Frye, Richard N. The Heritage of Persia. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1962.

Gnoli, Gherardo. The Idea of Iran: An Essay on Its Origins. Rome: Istituto Italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente, 1989.

Howard-Johnston, James. Witnesses to a World Crisis: Historians and Histories of the Middle East in the Seventh Century. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.

Shahbazi, A. Shapur. 'Khusro II.' Encyclopaedia Iranica (online). Last updated 2017.

Shaki, Mansour. 'Mazdak.' Encyclopaedia Iranica (online). Last updated 2019.

Wiesehöfer, Josef. Ancient Persia from 550 BC to 650 AD. Translated by Azizeh Azodi. London: I.B. Tauris, 1996.

Yarshater, Ehsan, ed. The Cambridge History of Iran. Vol. 3: The Seleucid, Parthian, and Sasanian Periods. 2 parts. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.

The Arab Conquest and Its Immediate Aftermath

Crone, Patricia. Slaves on Horses: The Evolution of the Islamic Polity. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980.

Crone, Patricia, and Martin Hinds. God's Caliph: Religious Authority in the First Centuries of Islam. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986.

Dennett, Daniel. Conversion and the Poll Tax in Early Islam. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1950.

Donner, Fred McGraw. The Early Islamic Conquests. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1981.

Kennedy, Hugh. The Great Arab Conquests: How the Spread of Islam Changed the World We Live In. Philadelphia: Da Capo Press, 2007.

Robinson, Chase. 'Abd al-Malik. Oxford: Oneworld, 2005.

Shaban, M. A. Islamic History: A New Interpretation. 2 vols. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1971–1976.

The Conversion Process

Bulliet, Richard. Conversion to Islam in the Medieval Period: An Essay in Quantitative History. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1979.

Bulliet, Richard. Islam: The View from the Edge. New York: Columbia University Press, 1994.

Choksy, Jamsheed K. Conflict and Cooperation: Zoroastrian Subalterns and Muslim Elites in Medieval Iranian Society. New York: Columbia University Press, 1997.

Morony, Michael. Iraq After the Muslim Conquest. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984.

Pourshariati, Parvaneh. Decline and Fall of the Sasanian Empire: The Sasanian-Parthian Confederacy and the Arab Conquest of Iran. London: I.B. Tauris, 2008.

Tor, Deborah G. Violent Order: Religious Warfare, Chivalry, and the 'Ayyar Phenomenon in the Medieval Islamic World. Würzburg: Ergon Verlag, 2007.

The Umayyad Caliphate

Hawting, Gerald. The First Dynasty of Islam: The Umayyad Caliphate, AD 661–750. 2nd ed. London: Routledge, 2000.

Humphreys, R. Stephen. Muawiya ibn Abi Sufyan: From Arabia to Empire. Oxford: Oneworld, 2006.

Marsham, Andrew. Rituals of Islamic Monarchy: Accession and Succession in the First Muslim Empire. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2009.

Robinson, Chase. Empire and Elites after the Muslim Conquest: The Transformation of Northern Mesopotamia. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

The Abbasid Revolution and Early Abbasid Period

Kennedy, Hugh. When Baghdad Ruled the Muslim World: The Rise and Fall of Islam's Greatest Dynasty. Philadelphia: Da Capo Press, 2004.

Kennedy, Hugh. The Prophet and the Age of the Caliphates: The Islamic Near East from the Sixth to the Eleventh Century. 3rd ed. London: Routledge, 2016.

Lassner, Jacob. The Shaping of Abbasid Rule. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1980.

Sharon, Moshe. Black Banners from the East: The Establishment of the Abbasid State — Incubation of a Revolt. Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1983.

Van Bladel, Kevin. From Sasanian Mandaeans to Ṣābians of the Marshes. Leiden: Brill, 2017.

The Persian-Islamic Synthesis: Culture, Language, Literature

Dabashi, Hamid. The World of Persian Literary Humanism. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2012.

Davis, Dick. Epic and Sedition: The Case of Ferdowsi's Shahnameh. Fayetteville: University of Arkansas Press, 1992.

de Bruijn, J. T. P. Persian Sufi Poetry: An Introduction to the Mystical Use of Classical Poems. Richmond, Surrey: Curzon, 1997.

Meisami, Julie Scott. Persian Court Poetry. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1987.

Rypka, Jan. History of Iranian Literature. Translated by Karl Jahn. Dordrecht: Reidel, 1968.

Yarshater, Ehsan. 'The Persian Presence in the Islamic World.' In The Persian Presence in the Islamic World, edited by Richard Hovannisian and Georges Sabagh. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

The Samanids and Eastern Dynasties

Barthold, W. Turkestan Down to the Mongol Invasion. 4th ed. London: Luzac, 1977.

Frye, Richard N. The Golden Age of Persia: The Arabs in the East. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1975.

Frye, Richard N. Bukhara: The Medieval Achievement. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1965.

Tor, Deborah G. 'The Islamization of Iranian Kingly Ideals in the Persianate Fürstenspiegel.' Iran 49 (2011): 115–122.

The Ulama and Islamic Institutions

Chamberlain, Michael. Knowledge and Social Practice in Medieval Damascus, 1190–1350. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.

Crone, Patricia. God's Rule: Government and Islam. New York: Columbia University Press, 2004.

Hallaq, Wael. A History of Islamic Legal Theories: An Introduction to Sunni Usul al-Fiqh. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

Lapidus, Ira. A History of Islamic Societies. 3rd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014.

Mottahedeh, Roy. Loyalty and Leadership in an Early Islamic Society. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1980.

Patton, Walter Melville. Ahmad ibn Hanbal and the Mihna. Leiden: Brill, 1897.

The Translation Movement and Islamic Intellectual History

Endress, Gerhard. 'The Circle of al-Kindī.' In The Ancient Tradition in Christian and Islamic Hellenism, edited by Gerhard Endress and Remke Kruk. Leiden: Research School CNWS, 1997.

Gutas, Dimitri. Greek Thought, Arabic Culture: The Graeco-Arabic Translation Movement in Baghdad and Early Abbasid Society. London: Routledge, 1998.

Montgomery, James. Al-Jahiz: In Praise of Books. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2013.

The Safavid Period and Long-Term Consequences

Babayan, Kathryn. Mystics, Monarchs, and Messiahs: Cultural Landscapes of Early Modern Iran. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2002.

Matthee, Rudi. Persia in Crisis: Safavid Decline and the Fall of Isfahan. London: I.B. Tauris, 2012.

Newman, Andrew J. Safavid Iran: Rebirth of a Persian Empire. London: I.B. Tauris, 2006.

Savory, Roger. Iran under the Safavids. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980.

Comparative and Theoretical

Fowden, Garth. Empire to Commonwealth: Consequences of Monotheism in Late Antiquity. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993.

Lambton, Ann K. S. State and Government in Medieval Islam. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1981.

Watt, W. Montgomery. The Influence of Islam on Medieval Europe. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1972.

End of The Conquered Conquerors. This case study is part of the collection Patterns of Power: Systematic Analysis of Elite Control Mechanisms Across Civilizations. © Thomas J. Bryan.

*****Copyright and Licensing*****

© 2026 Thomas J. Bryan

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License.
To view a copy of this license, visit: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/

*****You are free to:*****
- Share — copy and redistribute the material in any medium or format
- Adapt — remix, transform, and build upon the material

*****Under the following terms:*****
- Attribution — You must give appropriate credit

- NonCommercial — You may not use the material for commercial purposes

*This case study is part of the collection *Patterns of Power: Systematic Analysis of Elite Control Mechanisms Across Civilizations**